DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 437 SO 012 363

AUTHOR Dobbs, Stephen M., Ed.
TITLE Arts Education and Back to Basics.
INSTITUTION National Art Education Association, Reston, Va.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 178p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Art Education Association, 1916 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091 ($8.95)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aesthetic Education: *Art Education: Art Teachers: *Basic Skills: *Educational Needs: *Educational Objectives: Elementary Secondary Education: Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The document presents 14 essays designed to help art educators understand the nature and scope of basic education and what and how the arts contribute to it. John Goodlad presents a basis for considering the arts as an essential ingredient of schooling. A. Graham Down discusses the concerns of the Council for Basic Education and suggests that arts are linked with basic educational interests. Martin Engel illustrates the "basicness" of the arts by linking the development of language, cognitive functioning, communications technology, and contemporary life. Harry Broudy shows how the aesthetic experience gives expressive form to life, thus creating a foundation for cognition, judgment, and action. Elliot Eisner discusses conservative influences on the arts in education, while Edmund Feldman presents his case for the primacy of visual modalities in schooling using ideas from anthropology and linguistics. Vincent Lanier presents art as a validation of our social and cultural lives. Michael Day describes the limitations of the theories of child art and offers ways to expand those concepts. Kathryn Bloom discusses arts education as a catalyst for student motivation and performance, while Irving Kaufman states that art education should become a self-sufficient discipline. Diana Korzenik examines the ideal preparation of art teachers and Roger a Degge describes the afflictions resulting from narrow notions of what constitutes a good art experience. Thomas Hatfield encourages arts educators to examine their economic potential and political potency while Virgina Brouch and Judith Kula identify specific skills needed in arts programs. (Author/CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Arts Education and Back to Basics

ED183437

STEPHEN M. DOBBS,
EDITOR

FEB 29 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Mahlmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A
Publication
of the
National
Art
Education
Association

1916 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia
22091

1979

SP 013 363

CONTENTS

Introduction
Stephen Mark Dobbs, San Francisco State University . . . 5

1 **Education in What is Basic**
John Goodlad, University of California at Los Angeles . . . 11

2 **Art, Basic Education, and the Back to Basics Movement**
A. Graham Down, Council for Basic Education 27

3 **The Arts as Basic Skills**
Martin Engel, National Institute of Education 39

4 **How Basic is Aesthetic Education? Or is 'Rt the Fourth R?**
Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign 55

5 **Conservative Influences on the Arts in Education**
Elliot W. Eisner, Stanford University 67

6 **Back to Images**
Edmund Burke Feldman, University of Georgia 83

7 **Enhancing the Aesthetic Potential**
Vincent Lanier, University of Oregon 95

8 **Child Art, School Art, and the Real World of Art**
Michael Day, University of Minnesota 113

9 **Arts Education:**
Catalyst for Student Motivation and Performance
Kathryn Bloom, Arts in Education Program
of The JDR 3rd Fund 129

10 **A Return to Fundamentals**
Irving Kaufman, The City College, City University
of New York. 141

3 FEB 2 6 1980

11 **Back to Basics and the Preparation of Art Teachers**
Diana Korzenik, Massachusetts College of Art 153

12 **What Do Teachers Need to Make Art Basic?**
Rogena M. Degge, The Ohio State University 167

13 **Arts, Politics, and Change in the Schools**
Thomas A. Hatfield, South Carolina Department of Education 181

14 **Forward to the Basics!**
Virginia M. Brouch & Judith A. Kula, Florida State University 195

Contributors 211

4

Introduction

STEPHEN MARK DOBBS

This is a book whose time has come! No theme is more topical and hotly debated in American education today than the back to basics movement, which has consequences for every area of the curriculum, including the arts. The emphasis on basics in schools is only the tip of a conservative iceberg which may now be pervasive in American life, resulting in large measure from the searching reexamination of our values and our institutions in the wake of the disasters of the Sixties and Seventies, Vietnam and Watergate. Political and social turmoil has produced a spirit of solicitude, a yearning for the clarity, simplicity, and directness of the uncomplicated, good old days. Perhaps this is not as much of a simplification as it sounds. Basic literacy is still a major problem in the schools, and the patience of the public appears exhausted with sociological explanations of why Johnny can't read. Something equivalent to the Proposition 13 taxpayer's revolt is happening throughout the land; the call is heard for a "return" to traditional values and methods based on the Three R's, a curriculum unencumbered by "soft" subjects, electives, and educational jargon.

For advocates of the arts in education, this revaluation of American education presents both problems and opportunities. At worst it may tempt some arts educators to sacrifice their best rationales for arts programming in order to do anything required to hitch a ride on the latest educational bandwagon. At best the back to basics movement allows new chances to prove and promote the role of the arts in the essential education of the young. It all may depend, of course, upon how thousands of school boards define what "basic" education is, and how liberal and generous they are prepared to be in deciding what fits their definition. Yet all this strikes one as somewhat familiar. Haven't we been at this place before? Were not previous professional dialogues about basic and general education also the catalyst for arts educators of earlier eras to assert the fundamental nature and consequence of their subject area?

To proclaim that the arts belong in a basic education is clearly not something new. The rhetorical tradition can be traced to such early writers as Benjamin Franklin, who saw drawing as facilitating hand-eye coordination and the development of good penmanship.[1] Return to almost any decade, and one can find in the literature, especially at conferences where college professors and superintendents had large captive audiences, considerable rhetoric about art and the basics. For example, in 1919, George Eggers, Director

of the Art Institute of Chicago, addressed the National Council on Education on the subject, "Art as an Essential in General Education." In 1927 the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, meeting in Seattle, adopted a resolution stating that "We are rightly coming to regard music, and other similar subjects as fundamental in the education of American children. We recommend that they be given everywhere equal consideration and support with other basic subjects."[2]

Organizationally, too, the early art educators were allied with basic or, as it was called, vocational interests. The Department of Vocational Education and Practical Arts was formed early in the twentieth century by art educators, home economics types, and others. Art educators like Arthur Wesley Dow of Teachers College and Walter Sargent of the University of Chicago played leading roles. Sargent especially did more than suggest drawing instruction for mainly industrial purposes, such as motor coordination and the training of taste. He also understood that such experience in art could be basic to thinking, that drawing was a language.[3] Furthermore, a major linkage between the art curriculum and the general educational program of the school emerged in the 1920's with the popularization of the "scientific" approach to curriculum-making devised by Franklin Bobbitt, which involved detailing objectives. Some art educators became addicted to this methodology and utilized the format to establish connections between art and the rest of the curriculum. The textbooks of Frederick Nyquist, William Whitford, and Leon Winslow testify to this influence.

In the 1920's art educators broke away from the vocational educators and began to meet again with a focus on art, but the maintenance of utilitarian rationales linking art and the general curriculum continued. In the writings of Sallie Tannahill, Walter Klar, and Florence Nicholas we see the on-going development of this instrumentalism, which attempted to bind art to the basic curriculum by making it a handmaiden to general objectives of schooling. By the 1940's and 1950's the tradition was firmly entrenched. Art in the service of perceptual and motor development, mental health and leisure time, and psychological and social maturation were promoted primarily by the psychologists who dominated the professional field, such as Viktor Lowenfeld, Henry Schaefer-Simmern, and Rudolf Arnheim. The critic and historian Herbert Read even suggested that education in art was education for peace and world citizenship.[4] By the 1960's a new breed of art educators was emphasizing affective education and non-verbal communication, popular themes in general education. A vast litera-

ture of educational romance and reform during the 1960's and 1970's teemed with humanistic emphasis and universal demand for more significant arts education and experience, often as a nonverbal antidote to the excessively discursive character of American schooling.

Thus arts education through the years has often been organized philosophically around targets of opportunity, those rationales and trends which at the time had substantial social and political support in public education. This led to a manifestly utilitarian and instrumental quality in the justifications for arts education programming. Will the back to basics movement create similar rationales? Or are there opportunities in the basics theme which allow for the development of arts education curriculum on its own merits, as a self-sufficient and idiosyncratic yet integral aspect of students' basic growth and development? For example, it is clear that nondiscursive discourse creates levels of meaning which can enhance human life just as conventional "reading" can, and these are perhaps just as necessary for sufficient adult literacy in a culture so immersed in images as sources of information and experience.[5] Persuasive linkages among all of the different kinds of languages that exist, the aesthetic as well as others, may demonstrate better than anything the "basicness" of the arts, while at the same time recognizing the very important auxiliary role the arts play in fostering perception, in acquiring skills of constructive criticism, in appreciating cultural values, in learning how to choose and act morally, and in growing and changing in other ways.

At the same time that back to basics may offer fresh entry for arts education, we must maintain a realistic perspective as to what can be accomplished, given the historical record in schools. Jacques Barzun, certainly one of the most eminent spokesman for basic education, and a supporter of the arts in education, has cautioned that "American education has pursued a policy of overstatement about its role and substance; it has lived by continual exaggeration of what it is and what it can do."[6] Arts educators have been as guilty as any of "educational inflation," with well-meaning but ill-conceived advertising through which we sought to promote our field. For example, the mellifluous verbiage of the progressives and the creativity movement carried messianic overtones, suggesting the very liberation of children on the wings of art. Such language was inspiring but singularly ineffective, and useful only for school board reports.[7] Hard-headed superintendents and principals still wanted to see the product match the promise. It is just as true today that people are fed up with the lack of correspondance

between what educators say ought to happen in schools and what actually transpires there. No doubt the gap between the rhetoric and the reality helped fuel the back to basics movement in the first place.

Thus ammunition is provided for those who say the schools have tried to be all things to all people, and consequently have lost their sense of purpose. This reaction is likely to be manifest in excessive and parochial definitions of what constitutes the basics; the extreme position is to organize schools exclusively around hard-core "academic" courses or "solids," noteworthy in their nature and scope for their resemblance to the curriculum of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. But as the authors of the following chapters attest, the back to basics boom also presents fresh chances for important inroads. The educational trend is compatible with the intrinsic and authentic interests of arts education. Each of these writers, outstanding educators in their respective fields, shares a commitment to human growth and development, to the improvement of the schools and professional preparation of teachers and curriculum, and to the arts and what they can do for the quality of life.

The themes addressed in this volume can help us better understand the nature and scope of basic education, and what and how the arts contribute to it. But the mainstreaming of the arts into the value system and curriculum of the school will require more. First, it will require surrendering the traditional tendency of many arts educators to retreat into the mystique of the arts: "If you just don't understand why it is important for children to have self-expressive experience I can't explain it to you!" This is tantamount to asking school boards to turn over significant resources of instruction and time in the school day to arts education on faith alone. Educators are too pragmatic to take that kind of leap. Second, it means identifying the outcomes which are attainable and educationally consequential in the arts. More salient research in the behavioral and social sciences is needed to demonstrate the bridges which can be built between growth which schools value and the kinds of learning nurtured by the arts. Third, we need to find allies who will speak up for the "basicness" of the arts. Perhaps "Schools need something from the outside to make them see the arts as absolutely basic," according to John Kerr.[8] Fourth, we must highlight the essential character of the arts so as to provide arts education which has integrity and substance and is not simply a made-to-order, opportunistic, jump-on-the-bandwagon pastiche. The utilitarian rationales have often stimulated purpose and survival, but in the long run arts education runs the risk of becoming very "un-

basic" if in fact we neglect to exploit its unique character, and instead seek primarily those ends which may also be achieved through excellence in other subject areas of the school curriculum.

The preparation of this book has been a most pleasant and interesting task. I wish to acknowledge the valuable counsel of Elliot Eisner, and the able editorial assistance of Beverly Jeanne Davis and the staff at the National Art Education Association. A special thanks is due to the colleagues whose contributions here testify to the promise and optimism flowing from the confluence of arts education and back to basics.

REFERENCES

1. Thomas Woody (editor), *Educational Views of Benjamin Franklin,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1934, p. 27.
2. *Proceedings of the National Education Association,* Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., 1927, p. 871. I am indebted to my colleague John Keel for bringing this interesting quotation to my attention.
3. Walter Sargent and Elizabeth Miller, *How Children Learn to Draw,* Boston: Ginn & Co., 1916.
4. Herbert Read, *Education Through Art,* New York: Pantheon Books, 1943.
5. Elliot W. Eisner (editor), *Reading, the Arts, and the Creation of Meaning,* Reston: National Art Education Association, 1978.
6. Jacques Barzun, Address at the National Convention of the National Art Education Association, Houston, Texas, March 1978.
7. For example, "[Teachers of art] can show men how to attain liberation from distraction in a vision of the immediate, how to lift their heads above the flux and enjoy union with the eternal, how to achieve the bliss of beauty, the rapture of fulfillment, the ecstasy of love." I've lost the reference but assure the reader that it is authentic!
8. *Christian Science Monitor,* November 29, 1976, p. 38.

EDUCATION IN WHAT IS BASIC*

JOHN I. GOODLAD
University of California, Los Angeles, and Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc.

EDITOR'S NOTE:
The basic question facing educators is: What are schools for? John Goodlad describes the problem of establishing priorities among the many purposes which have become associated with schooling. These expectations have confused and overwhelmed educators, and led to misguided attempts to be all things to all people. Back to basics is one reaction to the "clutter" and dissipation of the curriculum. Goodlad establishes a sound basis for considering the arts an essential ingredient of a basic and non-trivial educational program, leading to significant growth and development.

---

*This chapter is based on a paper given in January 1979 at the Fourth Annual Midyear Conference at Brigham Young University. Published by permission of the College of Education at Brigham Young University and of the author.

SPRING CLEANING

The lives of all of us have a way of becoming cluttered. The nature of this cluttering differs according to personal interests and life styles. In our household, a major problem is paper; it has a way of piling up around us: newspapers, magazines, books, catalogues, bills, requests to support various causes, and on and on. From time to time, we engage in minor skirmishes to cut down on this clutter and, for a few days, there is room to walk about without tripping over a pile of magazines and sending them slithering across the floor.

But there comes a time when these accommodations simply are not enough. A major purge is required, like the housecleaning my mother did every spring and the sulphur and molasses we took as children because it was supposed to be good for us—especially in the spring of the year. There is an urgency; we must simplify our lives. We must get back to a simpler, more fundamental, existence: subscribe only to the magazines we read regularly from cover to cover; no more books until all those in piles and on the shelves are read; a priority list (not more than five) of worthy organizations to support.

The process of rethinking priorities is good for mind, body, and soul. It rarely results in much streamlining; there simply are too many first, second, and third choices to make. But the process does give a sense of a fresh beginning, of determining what is important in our lives—if nothing else, a justification for the clutter which we know from previous experience will be back again very soon. By throwing out of our lives even a few low-priority items, we gain the impression of having created substantial room for new activities—far more than we threw out. Of great significance is the fresh awareness of what is at the center of our lives in daily living we know is and will be cluttered.

BACK TO BASICS

We have these periodic urges regarding schooling, too. We must get back to basics. The urge usually follows a time of inflated expectations for schooling, a time when schools were being asked to add still another function to those that have accumulated over several centuries. Having cluttered up the schools with virtually unlimited demands and, seemingly, having lost sight of the comprehensible school we once knew, we want to cut and prune so that we can see the trunk again. This is as understandable as it is to want to clear up the daily clutter in our personal lives. Done

carefully, with a sense of perspective as well as humor, the process can be beneficial.

But it also can be as misleading and as misguided as most of our individual efforts to run away from complexity and, indeed, civilization. Thoreau enjoyed his Walden for a year but came to recognize that three chairs were needed: one for himself, one for a friend, and one for civilization.

All of us are for basics, I assume. But defining them is more than a journey of personal nostalgia back to a school that is quite dim in memory—a school which probably was limited in its provision for my education and which today would not fit at all the needs of my child, my friend's child, or a changing civilization.

Yes, I am for basics—especially in education. But, along with a few million other Americans, when I start clearing away the clutter to get down to them, I have a terrible time trying to decide what to throw away. What I am about to throw away often appears to be as basic as whatever it is I am trying to get down to. Spring cleaning turns out to be spring clarification.

Our schools always have served social purposes; they always will. Virtually every educational goal now stated for schools arose
14 initially out of some social purpose. During the 1960's, social purposes virtually overwhelmed the educational ones. In his 1965 message to Congress, President Lyndon B. Johnson said: "If you look deeply enough into any of society's problems, you will find education at the heart of it." Such rhetoric launched the monumental Elementary and Secondary Education Act of that year, legislation designed not only to infuse the schools with change and innovation but also to rectify through the schools many of the problems and inequities in our society. Addressing a White House Conference on Education the following summer, Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said that we shall go down in history as the nation that used its educational system to clear up the slums, solve unemployment and poverty, rectify the inequities of disadvantage, and, indeed, create the conditions for world peace.

The President and Vice-President were both right and wrong. Education is a long-term, not a short-term, answer to society's basic problems. But crises of urban decay, slums, unemployment, and crime must be addressed through social engineering—at least at the outset—using the best fruits produced by education.

More than a dozen years after the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, school simply is not the place it was. One begins to realize what has been happening by listing the staff of an urban elementary school. A reporter of the *Los Angeles Times*

recently observed the following:

> Not only are regular classroom teachers on campus during the school day, but also 3-hour aides, 6-hour aides, 8-hour aides, parent volunteers, community workers, reading specialists, math specialists, a language specialist, a motor-skills specialist, a multi-cultural coordinator, a speech and hearing teacher, a full-time counselor, a school psychologist, and a nurse.
>
> Altogether, more than 200 adults are on the schoolgrounds during the day—a ratio of one adult to every 5 or 6 children.

A lot of clutter? I should say so! Let's clear it up. Where do we begin? Which spigot of federal dollars should be turned off and who will be the first to turn it? And which turned-off spigot will be least noticed by some constituency?

Let us call the first of many staff meetings to determine our priorities, to get back to basics. But, first, who is a member of the staff? Who is not? Who decides who belongs and does not belong to the staff? And what is our first question? Stop the world; I want to get off!

WHAT IS A SCHOOL FOR?

There is no doubt in my mind that the most fundamental question we should be asking at this time is, "What is a school for?" It seems at times that we have forgotten that the school is an educational institution. Few of us stop to ponder what education is. Many persons outside of the schools simplify the answer, vaguely conjuring up a school that never was. Too many educators have allowed things other than education to move to the center of their educational lives. It is a long time since some of us paid homage to the essence of our profession.

It is clear that, in a relatively short period of time, our schools have taken on a host of functions previously assumed by other institutions. Sometimes, these institutions gladly gave up responsibilities making increased demands which these institutions felt ill-prepared to meet. Sometimes, we paid thoughtless homage to the concept of universal education in adding to the schools' educational and other responsibilities better assumed elsewhere. The schools also have taken on functions and tasks not envisioned for any existing institution and that no new institutions appeared to assume.

Many proponents of the back-to-basics movement have failed to assess the extent to which schools simply became overwhelmed with what society called upon them to do. Critics often view the largely undeveloped reforms of the 1960's as the basis for diag-

nosing malaise in schooling. This is an unfortunate, misleading analysis. The problem of our schools is not that they embarked during the 1960's on a self-destructive voyage of innovation, resulting in diminished attention to the three R's. If one looks carefully into the reforms proposed during that "schooling decade," one finds that many of them had a solid foundation, if not in specific research then at least in general concepts and principles emerging from several disciplines focused on human development and learning. One of the major reasons few of them took hold is that they required substantially new behaviors of teachers—behaviors that could be acquired only through intensive programs of teacher re-education. But we were in a hurry in those days to correct the entire social order through our schools. There was not time to re-educate masses of teachers. And so the supposed reforms of the 1960's were largely non-events.

Meanwhile, the schools simply became increasingly overwhelmed with new expectations, many of them legislated by state governments. Federal funds were directed at special interests of all kinds and their utilization in schools burdened by paperwork and an array of demands for accountability. Large numbers of schools lost their sense of central purpose. They became so cluttered that they lost the symmetry necessary to the effective functioning of any institution.

Finding a solid educational road to walk on today involves much more than clearing up debris, as after a storm. It involves asking and answering fundamental questions about what education is and schools are for. If we want our schools to fulfill all of society's neglected and emerging needs—and this is one possible scenario—then we must put them on a 24-hour-per-day schedule and staff them for continuous operation. Or, we may want to trim off everything that appears to be only marginally educative, leaving what we believe to be centrally educative to schools. But, in so doing, it will be necessary to create other institutions to handle, for example, many kinds of training having little or no fundamentally educational character.

No matter how we go, however, there always will be an educational function to be performed—a function which will be served only casually and marginally unless it is assigned specifically to an institution. This means that we are forced to clear our minds regarding what education is. Further, we must define that part which is particularly reasonable and appropriate for schools to do because, clearly, schools now provide only a fraction of the educating done in our society.

WHAT EDUCATION IS

Lawrence Cremin defines education "as the deliberate, systematic and sustained effort to transmit or evoke knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, and sensibilities."[1] Education is not, then, something confined solely to schools. Clearly, there is a multiplicity of institutions, agencies, individuals, groups, and organizations that educate. But schools are the only ones specifically charged to do so and the ones first blamed when shortcomings thought to be educational in nature show up in society, its adult citizens, or its youth.

Society squeezes out the educational functions of schools at their peril. But this is precisely what we have been doing in recent years. It may well take a decade or more of thought and action to put education at the center of schooling once again. The largely intellectually bankrupt back-to-basics movement of the '70's will not put education at the center again. However, it has served as a catharsis. In the same way, cleaning aside refuse and clutter is useful—so long as we do not confuse some resulting order and neatness with fundamental improvement.

We have been spending a great deal of time and money in recent years on trivia. In some strangely misguided preoccupation with what we think to be efficient and economically sound, we have confused education with training. We even have been talking about such a thing as "overeducation." David Saxon, president of the University of California, had this to say about the concept of being overeducated:

> Let's examine this curious new term, overeducation. Over education for *what*? Too much learning for a full and satisfying life? Too much schooling for a lifetime of changing careers in a rapidly changing world? Too much education for active participation in the affairs of a modern democratic government?
>
> I think we are more in need of wisdom today than at most earlier stages in our history. A broad liberal education is not the only ingredient of wisdom, but it is an essential one. We need all the knowledge we can muster to meet our technological and scientific problems. We need all the accumulated experience and understanding of humanity we can absorb to meet our social problems. And I believe we can ill afford the risk of foreclosing the maximum cultivation of that knowledge and understanding simply because it seems not to be required for immediate vocational purposes.[2]

We have trivialized education and at the same time beguiled ourselves into thinking that being able to perform hundreds of little

tasks as measured by student proficiency tests and getting an education are the same thing. Education is a process of individual becoming. The aim of education is to have this process occur or, better, to have it flourish. The essence of the process is the growth taking place in the individual and the meaning of that growth for the individual. The richer that meaning, the more it creates a desire for continued growth, the better the quality of the educational experience. To quote from John Dewey:

> Since growth is the characteristic of life, education is all one with growing; it has no end beyond itself. The criterion of the value of school education is the extent in which it creates a desire for continued growth and supplies means for making the desire effective in fact.[3]

How does one break down such a concept of education into hundreds of precise proficiencies? And, if we could, is one to believe that mastery of each in turn is synonymous with being educated?

We have gone to such excess with our cult of efficiency that our folly should soon become abundantly clear to many people. Preparing school administrators to satisfy lists of competencies did not produce competent administrators. Preparing teachers according to lists of teaching competencies did not produce competent teachers. Preparing our young to pass proficiency tests will not produce a generation of educated adults.

If we can get some of these trivia cleared off the cluttered road, we may be able to get down to what is basic in education. To be basic means thinking and feeling, using our senses, imagining, expressing, and communicating—all those wonderful, educable human traits that defy categorization and tests of proficiency. We need to explore the infinite possibilities schools might employ for extending and refining these ways of functioning—in effect, for providing quality educational experiences.

What dismays me, however, is the readiness of educators, not just persons who have no professional reason for thinking deeply about education, to trivialize what education is all about. Alfred North Whitehead's words come to mind: "When one considers in its length and breadth the importance of a nation's young, the broken lives, the defeated hopes, the national failures which result from the frivolous inertia with which it (education) is treated, it is difficult to restrain within oneself a savage rage."[4]

GOAL FOR SCHOOLS

Again and again, when one becomes depressed over such

thoughts, one is brought back to a state of hope and optimism by the answers one gets on asking people to think seriously about what their schools should do. Ronald McIntire created what he calls "The School Game."[5] It provides any one who wishes to play it an opportunity to select the characteristics he wants for schools. Approximately 60 descriptive statements are on a set of cards—one to a card. Six of these are goal statements. They include academic, vocational, social, and personal goals for children and youth. The task is to go through the set, selecting "likes" and discarding "dislikes." The task is taken seriously, mothers and fathers sometimes disagreeing and often wanting different emphases for different children. But what almost invariable comes out is that everyone wants all of these educational goals for his or her children in school.

This should not surprise us. Educational goals for our schools have broadened steadily during the more than 300 years since provision first was made for public schooling. Children in our earliest schools were required to learn the laws of the land and the principles of religion. This set has broadened to include today most of what we label the three R's. Then, as the complexities of an industrialized society increased, choosing and preparing for earning a living became more complicated. "Vocational" education was born. Next, with rapid urbanization, there was need for greater stress on learning effective citizenship skills for adaptation to varied forms of social life. Although education for personal, individual development was discussed earlier, it did not blossom until well into the 20th century. Paraphrasing John Dewey, it became no longer enough to be a good worker, a good citizen, or a good mother or father. The educated individual is one who grows and profits from personal experience, reinterpreting that experience so as to set new goals requiring the development of personal talents and abilities.

When forced to choose among these sets of goals for their children in school, parents prefer not to. They want all of them. Fortunately, all are potentially educational in character, if properly addressed, and so are appropriate for schools.

In recent years, various groups of policy makers in education, including state legislators, have endeavored to define basic education—that is, the education to be provided by funds distributed from other than strictly local sources. They start out trying to prune and trim, to cut away the nonessentials. But they almost invariably end up articulating approximately a dozen goals which, in a very real sense, reflect the will of the people:

1. Mastery of basic skills or fundamental processes;

2. Preparation for job satisfaction and career;
3. Intellectual skills basic to independent judgment and continued learning;
4. An understanding of our traditions and values;
5. Ability to function in a variety of social settings;
6. Ability to plan and organize for the realization of personal goals;
7. Knowledge and skills basic to performing constructively as a citizen;
8. Self-understanding;
9. Aesthetic perception and sensitivity;
10. Emotional and physical well-being;
11. Moral and ethical character;
12. Self-realization.[6]

It is interesting to note the fundamentals traditionally listed under the first of these—that is, the mastery of basic skills or fundamental processes: (a) ability to acquire ideas in reading and listening; (b) ability to communicate ideas in writing and speaking; (c) ability to understand and utilize mathematical concepts; (d) ability to utilize available sources of information; and, (e) ability to read, write, and handle basic arithmetical operations.

These five sub-processes constitute a considerable mandate and usually are encompassed by the three R's or by what some would claim to be basic. But these sub-processes constitute an elaboration of only one of twelve major educational goals. We begin to see, then, the comprehensive character of the educational mandate under which our schools operate. It is my belief that schools have a responsibility to provide for all twelve of these goals in some reasonably balanced way—not just for the first. School administrators who take pride in going back to the basics, in emphasizing what is elaborated under the first goal only, abuse that mandate. Rather than being responsive and responsible, they are irresponsible—blatantly negligent with respect to the responsibilities for which our schools are charged and with respect to the present and future well-being of this nation's young people.

OUR PROBLEM WITH THE SELF

Although the goals articulated for our schools recognize the importance of personal goals of self-realization, there is much slippage between the rhetoric and the reality. As a people, we seem to suffer from a kind of congenital deformity when it comes to recognizing the creative, playful side of being human. To play, especially in schools, is to flirt dangerously with moral decadence, it seems. It

was Gunnar Myrdahl who observed insightfully that no nation has a more idealistic set of goals. Nonetheless, we seem unable to escape some original sense of sin, of needing to drape ourselves in mourning cloth while confessing the sense of sin which seems to arise from our realization of the gap between our ideals and our present attainments.

This makes us no less self-indulgent in our personal behavior. Rather, we simply want the next generation to secure atonement for our sins. And so, our schools must be, too often, prison-like places, with the trees, ravines, boulders, and hillocks meticulously removed. The late Ole Sand held as a criterion of a good school peals of laughter coming out of classrooms and reverberating down the hallways. No, most people want schools to be very serious places, where learning is somewhat drab and hurts a little. It is those goals at the end of our list—self-understanding, emotional and physical well-being, aesthetic perception, and sensitivity—that get short-changed. We articulate them, we begin to act as though we believed in them, but those things humanistic, those things having to do most with being human and, therefore, most basic, don't quite break through. We seem not to be able to rise much above emphasis on work and coping when we think of our schools. Emphasis on cultivation of the individual lies waiting in the wings. Quoting Stephen Bailey, "Surely the educational system has no higher function than to help people to have creative engagements with the world of the free self."[7]

There is much more to education and schooling, then, than merely a noble set of goals. What we teach and how we teach have a great deal to do with the quality of the educational experience. To the extent that we push aside the arts and humanities because they appear not to be immediately practical and useful, to that extent do we deny children and youth huge areas of human experience in which to have creative engagements with the free self.

Yes, we need to learn to read and write and spell. But these are the lesser literacies—merely the tools for intellectual development, interpersonal relations, and much more. These lesser literacies do not include the educational equipment one requires to come to terms with life—sensibilities often thought of as part and parcel of the arts and humanities. I quote from Norman Cousins:

> The humanities would be expendable only if human beings didn't have to make decisions that affect their lives and the lives of others; if the human past never existed or had nothing to tell us about the present; if thought processes were irrelevant to the achievement of purpose; if creativity was beyond the human mind and had nothing to do with the job of living; if human beings

never had to cope with panic or pain, or if they never had to anticipate the connection between cause and effect; if all the mysteries of mind and nature were fully plumbed; and if no special demands arose from the accident of being born human instead of a hog or a hen.[8]

THE ARTS AND EDUCATION IN THE ARTS

The goal of aesthetic expression and appreciation has appeared in lists of state goals only recently. There are many avenues for creative expression and aesthetic appreciation, but the arts usually are regarded as a uniquely promising vehicle. The arts are not cumulative in the sense that one must know and understand the entire field before contributing something creative or enjoying an aesthetic experience. But perhaps it has been because we regard the arts as nonessential—something to be enjoyed or engaged in after more basic needs are met—that we delayed so long before including arts teaching among our expectations for schools. And elected school officials and school administrators usually are quick to reduce offerings in the arts just as soon as the back to basics cry begins to intensify.

22

And yet, there is no hard evidence regarding parental expectations to suggest the necessity of denying the arts to children and youth in schools. From as far back as we are able to trace humankind, men and women turned to creative expression just as soon as the most elemental needs for food and shelter had been met: drawing, dancing, story telling, acting out their thoughts and experiences. There is ample evidence today to show that people of all ages are turning to the arts, as participants as well as observers, in their search for richer lives and greater understanding of the meaning of life. To describe all of this as recreation would be to mislead. Mostly, it is to communicate, understand, or experience a sense of the quality of life and things.

There is no doubt that things we do not understand when first read or heard often become more meaningful when captured in color, or music, or dance, or on film. But just as the printed word means nothing if we cannot read, the subtle use of color, or the movement of dance, or the blending of musical sounds, means little or nothing if we have not learned to see, or hear, or feel.

Given the prevalence of art in our lives, it is difficult to understand why education in the arts in schools so often is regarded as esoteric and unnecessary. What a terrible misunderstanding! In truth, the arts are so basic that there is scarcely one of the twelve major goals of schooling cited earlier that does not involve the arts if it is to be addressed in any comprehensive way. To ignore the arts in seeking the attainment of these goals is to detract from the

full fruition of them. The summary of the contribution of the arts prepared by Kathryn Bloom and Jane Remer supports my observation:

1. The arts provide a medium for personal experession.
2. The arts focus attention and energy on personal observation and self-awareness.
3. The arts are a universal phenomenon and means of communication.
4. The arts involve the elements of sound, movement, color, energy, space, line, shape, and language.
5. The arts embody and chronicle the cultural, aesthetic, and social development of humankind.
6. The arts are a tangible expression of human creativity, and as such reflect humanity's perception of the world.
7. The various fields of the arts offer a wide range of career opportunities to young people.
8. The arts can contribute substantially to special education.
9. As a means of personal and creative involvement by children and teachers, the arts are a source of pleasure and mental stimulation.
10. The arts are useful tools for everyday living.[9]

It takes only a moment's reflection on this list to arrive at the conclusion that the arts have a potential to contribute significantly to all four sets of educational goals for schools listed earlier. The arts do not belong exclusively to the domain of personal development. They contribute just as much and as appropriately to the goals of citizenship, socialization, economic sufficiency, and the understanding of our civilization.

HOW FARE THE ARTS IN SCHOOLS?

If the arts have so much to offer to what education is and to what schools should do, then it is appropriate to ask oneself about the nature and extent of arts education in schools. A study conducted several years ago in Portland, Oregon, causes one to sit up sharply. After studying time distributed among subjects in the primary grades, the researcher concluded that mathematics, reading, and the language arts consume so much of classroom time that only a few minutes a day are left for everything else—social studies, science, and the arts. Several colleagues and I, studying classrooms in 67 elementary schools, concluded that the language arts dominate the curriculum. This does not mean that "language arts" as a subject appears to take up most of the time. But when one examines the way instruction in all subjects is carried out, one is forced to conclude that the language arts dominate. If

reading, mathematics, and the language arts are all that is basic, then there is no place to go back to. We are already there.

A group of colleagues and I currently are conducting a rather comprehensive study of what goes on in a small sample of schools in various regions of the United States.[10] Our study is based in large part on the premise that the nature and quality of educating in schools cannot be judged from standardized achievement tests. One must look inside the school to see what students are studying, how teachers are teaching, how young people and adults view their lives in school, and on and on. How ridiculous it is to think that we can judge the quality of educating in schools from six letter grades (A through F) and two sets of test scores (one quantitative and the other primarily linguistic) on standardized achievement tests.

One of our questions to students calls for them to rate school subjects in liking and importance. Very consistently, they rate the arts at the top of the list in liking and at the bottom in importance.

In reflecting on these and other data, one wonders if their answers reflect a view of the arts in general rather than the nature of their school experiences with the arts. The curriculum in the arts appears generally to be quite restricted in our sample of schools, the arts taught being almost exclusively visual and music. While more than seventy-five percent of the elementary school classrooms appear to have some instruction in music and the visual arts, eighty-seven percent of the teachers report no drama and seventy-eight percent report no dance. Total weekly instruction in art and music together in these classrooms about equals the time spent in physical education.

You probably will not be surprised to learn that the students in the elementary school classroom surveyed rated reading, language arts, and mathematics as the most important subjects—and, to repeat, the arts as least important. In the light of the fact that our data were collected at the peak of the back to basics movement, it is interesting to note that the parents in our schools surveyed expressed greatest satisfaction with their school programs in language arts and mathematics and least satisfaction with their school programs in the arts.

We may be missing a unique opportunity in our neglect of the arts. Several studies of adolescents in recent years suggest that many students are "turned off" by schooling. A large percentage of young people enrolled in secondary schools, especially in our major cities, are absent from schools for many days of the year even while registered in them. Schools, it sometimes is reported, do not appear to reach present interests and life-styles. When schools are accepted or tolerated, it is because they lead to more

schooling or to careers.

But the arts appear to be of high interest, even when the programs are limited and restricted. They may offer, then, an opportunity to rekindle interest in schooling. The arts are uniquely educative in character in that they link in so many ways to civilization and provide so many opportunities for individual development. And it is difficult to argue that they are not basic.

THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

The schools have taken on such an array of responsibilities and face so many crises that many of the people most responsible for them have not thought deeply about what schools are for. Collective bargaining, endless paperwork, and crisis management have moved to the center of their professional lives. Meanwhile, state leadership has trivialized education by defining it as hundreds of proficiency loops through which our young people are required to jump. It is not the jumping in and of itself that is so bad; it is the inevitable equating of such jumping with education itself.

Whenever we trivialize the ends of education, we inevitably trivialize the means. Indeed, trivial means become the ends, and we forget that education is a process of growing within which the ends emerge and become increasingly clear.

The accompanying corruption is the administration of tests from which we make judgments not just about students' rankings but also about the quality of the presumed educational experience. Total test scores or students' percentile rankings become virtually the sole evidence we use for passing definitive judgment on the adequacy of an individual's or a school's performance. "Large numbers of parents apparently suffer no pangs of conscience in withholding support and love or inflicting pain and humiliation on the basis of these letters and grades. Others bestow gifts and lavish praise on their achieving children with little thought to whether their marks were obtained with little effort, through cheating or at the expense of peers, some of them friends and neighbors.

But neither these dissatisfied/satisfied parents nor their fellow citizen non-parents give much thought to whether the students' curricula were well-balanced, their interest and curiosity aroused, their talents unleashed. Presumably, the almighty letter grade and the SAT score tell it all."[11]

If the spring cleaning in which we periodically engage for purposes of getting our educational house in order fails to bring us to fundamental questions about what education is, what our schools are for, and the desired quality of the educational experience, then our efforts will have gone for nought. The needed

reconstruction of our schools calls for much more than disposing of a little garbage or putting unimportant things in neater piles.

Some of our data, from the study referred to earlier, show that some schools often have a strange way of converting what could be creative and expressive to uniformity and conformity. Does our society want independent, autonomous, thinking individuals? Is the call for back to basics, rising to intense stridency about every twenty years, in actuality an expression of our discomfort whenever schools appear at long last to be recognizing individuality, creativity, and some tender concern for what is human? Will we be comfortable, can we be comfortable, when our schools truly provide creative engagements with the world of the free self? These are the kinds of questions we must be asking about our schools and ourselves.

REFERENCES

1. Lawrence A. Cremin, "Further Notes Toward a Theory of Education," *Notes on Education* 4 (1974), 1.
2. David S. Saxon, "Is It Time To Stop Learning?" *Newsweek* (June 26, 1976).
3. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education,* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916, p. 53.
4. A. N. Whitehead, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays,* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929, p. 22.
5. As part of a doctoral project; see Ronald G. McIntire, "The Development of a Conceptual Model for Selection of Optional Educational Programs in an Elementary School," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976.
6. For further analysis and development of these goals, see John I. Goodlad, *What Schools Are For.* Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1979 (in press).
7. Stephen Bailey, *The Purposes of Education,* p. 61. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1976.
8. Norman Cousins, "How to Make People Smaller Than They Are," *Saturday Review* (December, 1978), 15.
9. Kathryn Bloom and Jane Remer, "A Rationale for the Arts in Education," *The National Elementary Principal* 55 (Jan./Feb., 1976), 45.
10. A Study of Schooling (in progress). For further information, see John I. Goodlad, "What Goes on in Our Schools?" *Educational Researcher* 6 (March, 1977), 3-6; Harold Shane interviews John Goodlad, "A Preview of 'Schooling in America'," *Phi Delta Kappan* 60 (September, 1978), 47-50.
11. John I. Goodlad, "Can Our Schools Get Better?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 60 (January, 1979), 343.

ART, BASIC EDUCATION, AND THE BACK TO BASICS MOVEMENT

A. GRAHAM DOWN
Council for Basic Education

EDITOR'S NOTE:
A leading proponent of basics education has been the Council for Basic Education, whose executive director here argues that the arts can play a significant role in schooling. A. Graham Down first describes the concerns of the CBE and offers some reasons for the growth of the back to basics movement. He suggests that the arts are linked with basic educational interests, including a knowledge and understanding of human history and culture, interaction among the disciplines, and the nourishment of perception and imagination. Down proposes that courses in the arts meet rigorous standards and be designed to produce outcomes which can be clearly evaluated.

When I had the privilege of giving my views to David Rockefeller, Jr's Arts, Education and Americans panel in 1977, I had an unforgettable encounter with James Michener. Michener was evidently of the persuasion that there was no possible accommodation between the arts and the "basics" people. He presumed, as many do, that proponents of the basics were all fundamentalists who believe that education begins and ends with drill in the Three R's. There are such advocates of the basics, and their view of education is depressingly utilitarian. Like Horace Mann, they view education as a balance wheel in the social machinery. Others see education as a way out of the ghetto. They believe that one gets an education in order to get a job, and mastering the Three R's will do the trick.

The organization that I represent holds a different view. In *The Case for Basic Education* Clifton Fadiman wrote that basic education "concerns itself with those matters which, once learned, enable the student to learn all the other matters," and explained that "certain subjects have generative power."[2] The Council for Basic Education believes that the arts, properly defined and well taught, have generative powers, and that the arts should be included among the basic subjects all students take in school. (The other subjects in CBE's canon are English, mathematics, science, history, geography, government, and foreign languages.)

Since its formation in 1956, the Council for Basic Education has held to the conviction that schools should be centers of learning—that their first reason for being is to train young minds, not to socialize children. The Council also maintains that virtually all children can learn and that certain subjects (art and music among them) are more important than others (bachelor economics and transcendental meditation, for example). Although for the most part CBE welcomes the back to basics movement, we have reservations about some expressions of "basic" concern, including narrow definition of the basics, overemphasis on "law and order," and moral and political indoctrination. Therefore we attempt, wherever and whenever possible and appropriate, to give the movement responsible guidance.

I should like here to discuss the back to basics phenomenon—some of its causes, manifestations, and implications—by way of foreword to offering my view on why the arts are basic and the implications of this view for instruction.

The most incisive explanation for the back to basics movement

is what I call "educational consumerism." Parents have come to insist on having a voice in their children's education, and they are increasingly reluctant to leave it all to the professionals. There is general public concern about a decline in student achievement in the light of spiraling costs and decreasing enrollment. The appearance of advisory councils such as those recommended by the National Committee for Citizens in Education and the mushrooming of referenda like California's Proposition 13 also reflect this consumer attitude.

Another explanation is the reaction against the educational innovations of the last ten or fifteen years. Such developments as new math, programmed instruction, mini-courses and electives, and open classrooms have not resulted in demonstrably improved achievement. (A 1976 report by the American Institutes for Research confirms this opinion.)

The back to basics trend has also been influenced by the large amount of information the public has been receiving about the results of schooling. For instance, despite over fifteen years of federal aid (Title I, ESEA), elementary and secondary students have shown minimal improvement. New York City first reported achievement scores to the public in 1966, causing other cities to do likewise. The low scores reported have often been disturbing. The late James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education, was so appalled at the low level of reading achievement that in 1969 he called for a "Right to Read" campaign. In 1970, the National Assessment of Educational Progress began to report its findings of generally low achievement. Several state assessments confirmed this data. Finally, in 1972, reports of steadily declining scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Tests were made public. Two federally financed reports which stated that 15 to 20 percent of the young adult population were functionally illiterate, have been characteristic of this deluge of information. The public, then, perceives that school children are not achieving what they could and should, and there is evidence to support this belief.

The manifestations of the back to basics movement naturally reflect these causes. Concern about student achievement has led to interest in abolishing social promotion (the practice of passing children along from grade to grade on the basis of age and attendance rather than on the basis of demonstrated achievement or mastery). The Greensville County, Virginia, school district has received wide recognition for its promotion policy based on achievement. Many states have now adopted proficiency standards for high school diplomas (minimum competency tests), although the level of profici-

ency required and the subjects or skills tested varies from state to state and district to district. Both the abolition of social promotion and the adoption of minimum competency standards mean that greater attention is being paid to what students do and do not know, and in many instances special classes have been established to remedy deficiencies.

Concern about student achievement has a corollary—concern about teacher competence. Therefore new emphasis is being placed on in-service training for teachers, an emphasis of particular importance in the light of the current low teacher turnover. Other notable efforts to improve teacher competence include the San Francisco Bay Area Writing Program (and its spin-offs) in which teachers learn to teach writing by writing themselves, criticizing each other's writing, and then teaching still other teachers what they have learned; the College Board's Advanced Placement Program which gives college credit for rigorous course work in high school, thereby imposing high standards on the teachers; and the summer programs leading to a Master of Arts in Liberal Studies (MALS) offered by a consortium of selected colleges and universities.

32

The proliferation during the sixties and early seventies of minicourses, electives, and "relevant" courses has led to greater emphasis on the basic subjects and on more required courses. And it is this interest, coupled with tightening school budgets, which has led to the dilemma of defining which subjects are basic—and has sometimes resulted in the reduction or elimination of arts programming in school curricula. There is an apparent dichotomy here, for clearly interest in the arts is high. Museum attendance has never been greater. A recent Harris poll indicated that 69 to 86 percent of those polled in California favored teaching art courses for credit as an integral part of the curriculum.[3] Fred Hargadon, Dean of Admissions at Stanford University, is one of many who recommends that students study music or art or both at the secondary level.

If a reasonable case can be made for including the arts as one of the basic subjects, if the art curriculum is sufficiently substantive and demanding of hard work and discipline on the part of teachers and students alike, and if knowledge or achievement in art can be demonstrated by students showing that they know and can do something they didn't know or know how to do before, then art may not be perceived as an expendable frill, and its place in the curriculum must be rightfully secured.

Why, indeed, are the arts—the visual arts in particular—basic? There are clear reasons.

First of all, art is part of our culture, part of the history of mankind. As Robert Klotman, chairman of the music education department at Indiana University and president of the Music Educators National Conference, said, "The arts have embodied each culture's conception of itself."[4]

The late Oliver W. Larkin, Professor of Art at Smith College, echoes this sentiment when he says, "... [they] embody collective ideas, collective experience, belief, and purposes of a whole society. Throughout the ages, art has been the highest achievement of some peoples; for all of them it is one of the ways by which we come to know them."[5]

An understanding of human culture, knowledge of the paintings of Rembrandt and the sonatas of Beethoven, is as important as knowing about the plays of Shakespeare and the sonnets of Milton; all give insight into the life and thinking of the time. Joseph Kerman, Professor of Music at the University of California, Berkeley, wrote in *The Case for Basic Education.*[6]

> Art . . . is the depository of a kind of knowledge—knowledge not of things and ideas but of emotional and spiritual states. To spread this knowledge is part of the business of basic education . . . art *tells* something vital about man, his problems and possibilities, and his modes of response . . . we do not judge a man educated if he is ignorant of the arts; and we may as well accept the responsibility of this judgment. Courses in literature, visual art, and music should be required, not elective, in all secondary schools. . . . They should expose students to the great works of art; they should explain artistic techniques and principles as specifically as possible; they should train and encourage students in imaginative response.

I quote Mr. Kerman extensively because his views are as valid now as they were nearly twenty years ago. Basic subjects are always basic—and timeless.

A second reason for studying art is its importance in relation to other disciplines. "A study of history or literature is incomplete without at least an acquaintance with the art of the period; conversely, art gives the facts and drama of history a better perspective by illustrating historical events and ideas."[7] As a musician and former history teacher, I cannot conceive of teaching modern European history without also requiring some understanding of the interaction between Romanticism in art, architecture, music, and literature and the revolutionary movements which engulfed the European world at the turn of the century.

In some ways, the graduate schools may have a pernicious in-

fluence on American education by overemphasizing the separation of the disciplines. The arts, especially as they relate to the humanities, may well be the vehicle for bringing the disciplines together when appropriate.

Another reason for studying art in a studio or in an art appreciation class is to increase one's perception and imagination. Ann Benson writes:

> The imagination and attention to detail required to fashion sculpture from found objects or to solve a problem in perspective in a painting are the same kinds of skills, which, at the very least, are relevant to problem-solving in the classroom or in the boardroom. Frank Oppenheimer of the Exploratorium in San Francisco draws the connection of observing and synthesizing between the arts and the sciences. 'I think there are some parallels between what artists do and what scientists do. They both start by noticing things . . . much of the noticing of things that fit together in physics, as in art, is intuitive.'[8]

Keith P. Thompson, Associate Professor of Music Education at the Pennsylvania State University, voices the same sentiment: "The basic skills that are necessary for experiencing art, be it as a creator, performer, or consumer, are those skills that are necessary for the processing of knowledge—perceiving, interpreting, understanding, and expressing."[9] In other words, "the arts, properly defined and well-taught, should have generative effect; that is, a student should develop some of the same kinds of skills and basic knowledge from studying any one of the arts that are developed from studying other basic subjects."[10]

Justifications for the arts which include using them as a vehicle to improve achievement in other subjects such as reading are not, in my view, sufficient. Nor should a study of the arts be promoted as a means of fostering a "positive self-image." Such "verbal inflation"[11] dilutes the value of the arts. If, in order to merit worth, study of the arts must be linked to other goals, then they lose their credibility as discrete subjects, and it should not be surprising that they become "frills." The arts should be studied for their own sake, not in order to promote other goals.

The question, "Which of the arts should be taught?" defies an easy answer. Harry Broudy's distinction between serious and popular arts seems wise;[12] some of the work which goes under the guise of art in schools today would be more appropriately confined to recreation programs. Moreover, the broad definition of the arts given by the Arts, Education and Americans panel is disturbing. In CBE's review of their report, *Coming to Our Senses: The Signifi-*

cance of the Arts for American Education, we said,

> Going far beyond appreciating or practicing art, music, dance, and drama, or exploring their particular relationships to history or literature, or their roles in self-discipline and creative thinking, the panel would include film-making, analyzing television programs, and knowledge of electronic music among the arts. Certainly one should know something of the history of art and of music theory, for example, but when art becomes crafts and drama a mere circus, then the arts in our opinion are no longer a legitimate part of basic education.[13]

Although what "art-forms" are worthy of serious study may change over time (as a reflection of culture), what may be more important is how the arts are taught and what students are expected to know.

Robert J. Saunders, Art Consultant for the State of Connecticut Department of Education, expresses the view that "The best justification for art as basic is the art program which makes itself recognized as a basic learning process."[14] This view is shared by the Art Supervisor of Jefferson County, Kentucky: "Basics in art are skills and concepts—not projects . . . education in the visual arts must produce articulate, skilled, informed students."[15] Unfortunately, all too often school art curricula are not recognizable basic learning processes, and the arts are trivialized. Perhaps a legitimate and reasonable objective of art in basic education is understanding: understanding of art history, understanding which, to be meaningful, would necessarily include some "making" of art and some development of an appreciation for art. Such "making" art should not be aimless creativity; nor should it be done only by the talented. Indeed, traditionally the arts have been too performance-oriented. The merit of a musical program should not be judged merely in terms of the calisthenic or cosmetic quality of the marching band. Standards can be set and skills and techniques taught and evaluated. Because the arts should be for *all* students and not a selected few, instruction should be given in order to increase their understanding of artistic expression and communication.

Courses in the arts should include theory and analysis as well as practical demonstration. Students should, among other things, learn to recognize periods of style, major works by major artists, and influences of one artist upon another.

Curricula in the arts *can* be designed which are rigorous and substantive and which can produce measurable outcomes. For instance, several years ago, I was partially responsible for the devel-

opment of course descriptions and examinations for College Board advanced placement courses in music, history of art, and studio art. Passing scores on these examinations enable students of ability and achievement to receive college credit while still in high school. The assessment of studio art on the basis of a portfolio disproves the notion that one cannot "measure" art.

The 1977 report of the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP) on student progress in art demonstrates that art is indeed measurable and, moreover, the ability to produce art can be learned. Keith Thompson echoes the latter viewpoint when he says, "No more than any other subject area do the arts come naturally. They have to be learned and studied seriously in order to be apprehended."[16] It was disappointing, however, that less attention was devoted on the National Assessment to the "cognitive" aspects of art than to the "affective" and that, apparently, even fewer questions will be devoted to this aspect in the next assessment scheduled for this school year (1978-79). This deficiency undoubtedly reflects the same lack of attention to *knowledge* of art in the classrooms.

In light of the desirability of assessing art knowledge and skills, and if, as I suspect, it will be commonplace in the near future to have some form of "exit examinations" for students at the completion of elementary school, junior high school, and high school, then art must be one of the subjects assessed. Would it be too much, for instance, to ask that all students at the end of elementary school demonstrate some measure of proficiency either in studio art or in sight-singing? Would it be unrealistic to insist that all junior high school students take courses in art or music history which required analysis of the essential elements of style and recognition of the principal artistic periods? Finally, would it not be appropriate to require all high school graduates to demonstrate an ability to relate the arts to other disciplines in the humanities and thus break down some of those artificial barriers alluded to earlier? In all these examinations, even at the elementary school level, some writing should be required, so that a student could demonstrate the skills of recognition, description, and analysis.

One can anticipate the torrent of criticism that this proposal will elicit from professional art educators and others. For instance, it might be said that such a curriculum is elitist and well beyond the abilities of most students. The real problem may be that there is an insufficient number of classroom or art teachers interested in and capable of teaching it. The kind of inservice training referred to earlier might help overcome this barrier. It might also be said that

such a program is irrelevant to twentieth century life; that it neglects the truly creative and limits the student because it does not allow experimental approaches (film criticism, crafts, and so forth). As an essentialist, however, I advocate mastery of less over acquaintance with more. Such a program as I have suggested would respond to the proponents of the basics who rightfully, in my view, insist on measurable achievement in all subjects. Moreover, it would heal the apparent breach between the arts and the basics, would secure for the arts parity with the other essential subjects, and insure that all students have knowledge of the arts to serve them for the rest of their lives.[17]

REFERENCES

1. Arts, Education and Americans Panel, *Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.
2. James D. Koerner, ed. *The Case for Basic Education,* Boston: Atlantic-Little, Brown, 1959, p. 6.
3. Thomas E. Curtis, and Charles A. Speiker, "Aesthetics in American Education: A Position Statement," *Educational Leadership,* Vol. 35, No. 2, November 1977, p. 143.
4. Robert Klotman, "When You Go Back to Basics, Take Music Along," *Music Educators Journal,* Vol. 64, No. 1, September 1977, p. 77.
5. Koerner, *op. cit.,* p. 214-15.
6. *Ibid,* p. 218.
7. Ann Benson, "Artists in the Schools," *Council for Basic Education Bulletin,* Vol. 21, No. 9, May 1977, p. 6.
8. *Ibid.*
9. Keith Thompson, "How the Arts Function as Basic Education." *Music Educators Journal,* Vol. 63, No. 8, April 1977, p. 43.
10. Ann Benson, "*Coming to Our Senses:* A Review," *CBE Bulletin,* Vol. 22, No. 1, September 1977, p. 8.
11. Jacques Barzun, "Art and Educational Inflation," *Art Education,* October 1978, p. 5.
12. Harry Broudy, "How Basic is Aesthetic Education? Or is 'Rt the Fourth R?" *Educational Leadership,* Vol. 35, No. 2, November 1977, p. 136.
13. Benson, "*Coming to Our Senses:* A Review," *loc. cit.,* p. 2.
14. "Our Readers Write," *Council for Basic Education Bulletin,* Vol. 22, No. 1, September 1977, p. 14.
15. "Our Readers Write," *Council for Basic Education Bulletin,* Vol. 22, No. 3, December 1977, p. 17.
16. "The Arts Are Basic Education: Let's Move on It," *Music Educators*

Journal, Vol. 63, No. 4, December 1976, p. 43.

17. For further explication of the tenets of basic education see A.Graham Down, "Why Basic Education," *The National Elementary Principal*, Vol. 57, No. 1, October 1977, pp. 28-32.

THE ARTS AS BASIC SKILLS*

MARTIN ENGEL
National Institute of Education

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Symbolic discourse and the multiplicity of non-verbal languages create levels of meaning which are requisite to adult "literacy" but have been historically neglected in our schools. Martin Engel weaves a network of persuasive linkages between the development of language, cognitive functioning, communications technology, and contemporary life to illustrate the "basicness" of the arts. He poses questions for research which would help us better understand the ways in which the growth of perception and thought are affected by experience in various modes of the arts, so as to create a broader justification for the inclusion of the arts in the curriculum and a compelling basis for the enrichment of children's lives in schools.

---

*Based on a speech given at the First Annual Basic Skills Conference sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education Basic Skills Task Force, December 4-7, 1978, Washington, D.C. Points of view and opinions are those of the author and do not represent official policy or position of the National Institute of Education.

Let's play a game. I'll say a common phrase, and you respond with the first thing that comes to your mind. Ready? Basic skills! Your answer? Reading, writing, and mathematics. Right! Now let's keep going. Reading? Getting information from print. Right again. Once more. Writing? Putting information down on paper. O.K. What you mean is using language. How about mathematics? That's harder . . . but I think of using letters and numbers to solve quantity problems. What have we been talking about? Using language and other symbols, solving problems, and thinking. For purposes of a common understanding, and before we venture out upon the battlefield of argument, let us agree that the term "basic skills" includes, as its most important part, languaging, by which we mean receiving, comprehending, and using language in oral and written form. Why do we use language? There are many reasons, but a significant one is for purposes of communication; that is, language is a vehicle of communication ordinarily assuming the form of discursive, propositional prose, used aurally/orally and in reading and writing. Furthermore, we commonly assume language to be the primary vehicle of communication and therefore to be basic.

The question then must be posed: From whence comes this capacity to communicate through language, and where do the thoughts come from that we receive and transmit through language? Humans are not only communicating animals, but are thinkers and knowers, and it is the consequence of their thinking and knowing that they communicate. We tell each other what we think, and what we think we know. Indeed, our capacity to communicate derives from and is contingent upon our capacity to mentate; that is, to think and know. Thus, I would contend that the basic skill of "basic skills" is mentation; or, to use a more current term, cognition. Cognition and the ability to symbolize the cognitive process are profoundly interactive. Yet in Western civilization the arts have become separated from other modes of communication, just as Western man has separated reason from emotion, form from content, and mind from matter. Our common language reflects this dualistic obsession. That is why the languages of science are very different from the languages of the arts, which, unlike common discursive prose, are rich in the fusion of fantasy, myth, fiction, feelings, and the images of the factual, real world.

The key to an enriched understanding of what is basic among the learned skills of the young is therefore our awareness of the centrality of the cognitive process. It is the hub from which radiate the

various symbolic spokes, of which spoken and written languages number only two among many. In a recent article, Elliot W. Eisner leads us to seek a more balanced curriculum based upon a

> . . . conception rooted in an understanding of the nature and scope of cognition. It is not the case that certain cultural forms, such as the arts, to name but one example, are affective and mathematics cognitive. It is the case that each of the major cultural forms we call the arts and the sciences, the social studies and the humanities are symbol systems that humans use in order to know. They are all cognitive. Symbolic processes are the means through which what has become conscious can be publicly shared. . . . The structure or syntax of such public forms are often subtle and technical: They are encoded forms that one must learn to "read" if meaning is to be secured. A school curriculum that neglects attention to these publicly coded symbolic forms diminishes the child's opportunities to think in the modes these forms make possible.[1]

The processes whereby we transmit what we think and know both to ourselves and to others is a symbolic process, one mode of which is verbal, propositional, prosodic language. But there are many other time-honored and socially legitimized vehicles of symbolization. With the Western compulsion for classification and categorization, we have separated these various modes of symbolization, in the name of utility and efficiency, and have relegated most of them to the periphery of human affairs, retaining only verbal prose and mathematical symbolization as basic.

42

Which is not to say that this historical process is inexorable for all cultures and for all times. For many peoples of this planet, the various forms of the arts continue to be central to their coding process. The peoples of such cultures externalize what they think, feel, and know. However, in Western thought, the arts, once principal to the symbolic process, have been set aside, into museums, theaters, and concert halls. Have we thrown out the artistic baby in order to save the scientific bath water? In contrast, pre-literate cultures, and especially civilizations cherishing the oral tradition, had and still have highly developed symbolic codes: paintings on cave walls, dance, ritual, religious effigies, beaten and sung rhythms, chanting, incantation, the ornamentation of the body, weavings, carvings, clothing and building, the shape and structure of hut and temple, awesome looming statuary, painting on the ground with sand or on the skin with the juice of berries. Such a list is clearly endless and must be notable for the broad range of expressive art forms far beyond what we normally envision in our notion of the "fine arts."

These are sophisticated visual iconic codes which are epistemologically rich, containing many-layered meanings whereby these people create and know their construct of reality.

The world's body of art, the patterns in Aztec baskets, the Celtic zoomorphic arabesques, the melismas of the Gregorian chants, Tlingit totemic carvings, the steles of obsidian and porphyry of the ancient Assyrians, indeed the whole gamut of Malraux's Museum Without Walls, expresses, far more than the data-display screen of a computer, the message and meaning of a life, a society, and a period of history. Thus, there is significant literacy at work in "reading" medieval cathedrals, which were called "the Bible of the poor." We have historically learned to read these meanings because this aspect of our basic skills training, though neglected in our formal education, has been due to the inexorable tide of acculturation.

Modern Western written language evolved, as far as we know, from Sumerian cuneiform, through Phoenician and Greek alphabets. That is, from pictorial/iconic morphemes which were pictographic images of the perceptual world, to the more abstract wedge shapes that became the phonemes, or visual cues to spoken language. Thus, the roots of our written code were visually rich and meaningful, not unlike children's drawings, or the hieroglyphs of the ancient Egyptians. Interestingly, that evolution did not take place in Chinese and Japanese languages. Modern Japanese contains both the abstract, phonetic Ka-ta-ka-na as well as the ancient iconic/pictorial Kanji, with its schematic images. The Chinese character in many cases represents as idea rather than a word. In comparison, the Western written idiom has lost much but not all of that non-verbal network which was once woven through our language.

Let us interrupt our train of thought, momentarily, to look at the several points which are being suggested here:

1. We have many languages, and most of them (such as drawing and body language) are not verbal.
2. We language what we think and know; that is, our cognitive functioning manifests itself through myriad languages.
3. Though we can intellectually separate cognition from verbal and non-verbal languages, emphasizing verbal discourse and trivializing all the non-verbal codes, it is most likely that they are inextricably intertwined.
4. Basic skills, as presently understood, address only one

half of one half of the issue: They stress only the form, rather than the content or meanings inherent in the language, and they include only verbal and mathematical forms of symbolic codes, and none of the others. The fallacy lies in the presumption that the verbal and mathematical include all meanings necessary for adult functioning.

Let us emphasize this last point. The skill part of basic skills is the facility for language, and that facility is a potential. A skill, after all, is a potential for action, not an action itself. Thus, basic *skills* are conceived as process potentials. Such process focus tends to deemphasize, or set at the periphery, the significance of the content and meaning of language—its epistemological significance—in the sense of the plumbing apart from the water. Hence, Dick and Jane! As T.S. Eliot put it: Shape without form, shade without color Paralized force, gesture without motion.[2]

As usually understood, basic skills can be compared to the manual dexterity of a pianist at the keyboard. Our analogy may even include the skill to "sight-read"; that is, translate the printed score into the sequence of digital, motoric operations whereby sounds
44 are produced upon the musical instrument. But what does that mechanical process of sound production have to do with the content and meanings of music? Reading, as in reading books, is not the same thing as understanding, or comprehending the import of what the language is saying. To encode and decode print is only a sub-set of language comprehension, and when such comprehension becomes the focus of our attention, we realize that (1) we process a much larger array of symbolic codes than the functional language of everyday usage would lead us to believe, and (2) we rely upon the cognitive powers of the mind apart from the information processing function, or, more accurately, rely upon a variety of codifications of what our cognitive capability constantly constructs.

In regarding the language of the arts, we see that they are constructed of vocabularies and grammars that are already the repository of semantic reference. Rhythms, whether in music, architecture, drama, or poetry, need to be discerned not because rhythm is an artistic/syntactic device—a formal organizational element—but because it contains meanings and refers to, or symbolizes, the rhythmic dimensions of our experience. Such experiences, through perception and imagination, inform our constructs of reality, which is to say that rhythm is a cognitive construct. The rhythms of life are pervasive. We see, hear, feel, and imagine rhythm everywhere, and we know it by symbolizing it in the forms of the arts. To cite another

example, the same can be said for tone; just as our language is rhythmic, it is also tonally inflected, and that inflection, along with rhythm, contributes to meanings even in discursive prose. We all have had the experience of deriving correct meanings from sentences spoken by someone even though we cannot make out all the words. In this sense, the arts are constructed of highly concentrated doses or organized rhythm, inflection, harmonies, space, and time, and those other elements formal and representational, which transmit and from which we infer meanings. Western man, with his printing machines and telephones, inadvertently strives to disambiguate his everyday language; to strain out the tone, texture, inflection, color, rhythm, harmonies, and that multiplex richness of which the arts are made. It is highly revealing that when children mimic voice-producing robots or computers, they produce a flat, mechanical monotone.

David Olsen has written extensively about the change in the character of our language as it has evolved from the oral to the tradition of the text and written word.[3] It was, Olsen contends, the development of writing that made "rational" man and the development of science possible, and, of course, vice-versa. The pre-Gutenberg civilization used writing ". . . to prompt, that is, to facilitate recall of information that had already been committed to memory."[4] Olsen states that the writing system and the languages it presented were ". . . not sufficiently unambiguous to permit the decoding of novel statements."[5] Furthermore, information written at the time was generated out of orally collected memory, a repository informed by the cultural storehouse of proverbs, verse, songs, narratives, the epics and other artistic/unexplicit knowledge, knowledge shaped by its form as art. The history of Western thought and language is an evolution toward explicitness and unambiguousness culminating in mathematical discourse and a verbal logic made possible by print. In short, we have driven the art out of our dominant communicative modes.

46

What today remains of the artistic/aesthetic qualities in our verbal language are the elements of imagery and metaphor; the poetic vestiges of the oral tradition. I refer to figurative language—the figures of speech which are erroneously construed as sugar coating, mistaken as the embellishment of language for the young and mentally slothful. There is a lesson to be learned as we observe the decline in the use of pictorial material for the young in the course of their becoming readers. As they are asked to acquire competence in the reading of print, we implicitly suggest that the reading of pictures, once central to their literacy, is in fact inferior to

print and ought to be phased out. "Picture books are for kids!" It is also curious that the advertising industry, hard-headed and profit oriented, having no vested interest in whether or how well its market can read print, relies heavily upon highly stimulating visual imagery and the artistic devices which also permeate the film medium. I mean such elements as music and other dimensions of a fully developed sound-track, drama and theatrical settings, superb camera-work and the "suspension of disbelief," all in order to communicate; that is, sell their product. One gets the impression that the media industry has a much broader notion of literacy than the school-based reading and writing "industry." For those in education, figurativeness in language, that is, the artistic components, are deemed to have an appropriate place only if that language is artistic in intent in the first place; if it is poetry, fiction, or drama. And this kind of reading tends to be regarded as entertaining rather than significantly informative. It is unfortunate that in our modern lexicon of basic skills, literacy must be functional, or as unambiguous as possible, with as few confusing levels of meaning, as prosaic, direct, explicit, literal, and unimaginative as necessary to communicate to the largest possible population. Reducing complexity is presumed to optimize accessability. Such a conception of basic skills—functional literacy—short-changes the learner with its myopic parochialism. My contention is that the arts, and the artistic qualities of all languages, are essential containers of meaning, formed by and informing the cognitive process.

As a consequence of a conference on Reading and the Arts, held in 1977, the National Art Education Association issued a collection of the presented papers, edited by Elliot W. Eisner. The concern of the conference was to "describe the relationship between the forms of cognition used to read text and those used to read visual art."[6] Eisner asks what we mean by reading, as we read poetry, music, paintings, faces, body postures, and even tea leaves, palms, and futures. He suggests that such larger uses of the word "reading" represents "an intuitive grasp of the way our minds construe meaning from patterned events and objects, even if the "grammar" for such events and objects cannot be articulated."[7] He points out what cognitive research has been telling us for some time. "To conceive of reading as limited to text is to disregard our intuitive recognition that the construction of meaning from the perception of patterned stimuli is ubiquitous in human life and a skill necessary for survival."[8] Eisner is telling us that patterned stimuli are the epistemological cues in a vast variety of symbolic codes, containing the meanings which we comprehend as we

become literate in these codes. Learning to make and to read the arts—music, dance, drama, sculpture, and the like—is to learn to comprehend. Comprehension of printed text must not be the insulated, isolated activity now found in the schools. The arts are more than enrichment. They provide a nurturance to the development of comprehension skills which are a function of our cognitive capability.

The kind of research that has reinforced the contentions of Eisner and others who advocate a larger conception of literacy to include non-verbal and artistic modes of symbolization, has been conducted by the developmental psychologist Rawley Silver. She separates language and thought, and thereby diminishes the tyranny reading has held over thought in the educational philosophy of the reading and basic skills advocates. "There is considerable evidence in recent scientific literature that language and thought develop independently, that language follows rather than precedes logical thinking, and that, even though language expands and facilitates thought, high level thinking can and does proceed without it."[9] Silver goes on to list a number of cognitive functions developed through pictorial, rather than purely verbal learning activities. She includes organizing and representing experiences, activating or reinforcing language, imaginary play, abstract and non-verbal thinking, recall, and reality testing.[10] She describes research studies wherein cognitive growth is facilitated through visual art practice which stresses such concepts as class, or group of objects, concepts of space and concepts of sequential order which "are said to be basic in mathematics and reading."[11] Silver surmises that "The time may also be ripe for serious consideration of the role of art in developing cognitive skills." She includes such skills as the ability to select (content), to combine (form), and to represent (creativity).[12] Elsewhere, she lists numerous studies which demonstrate positive correlations between arts programs and achievement scores.

Rudolf Arnheim's views of perception theory are also relevant here. Based upon Gestalt psychology foundations, Arnheim's conception of the mind and its pattern-making functions are described holistically: ". . . the mind always functions as a whole. All perceiving is also thinking, all reasoning is also intuition, all observation is also invention."[13] Because the reading research community has tended toward analysis of sub-sets and micro-behaviors of larger, and necessarily messier activities associated with decoding and comprehension, it has ignored what Arnheim emphasizes; that thinking, knowing, comprehending, feeling, intuiting, perceiving,

conceiving, imagining, noticing, and all the other mental activities of the organism are of a piece and must be understood in their totality. Within this context the arts would very quickly be restored to their integral role in the essential communicative process of languaging. Arnheim, in *Visual Thinking,* points out that ". . . the arts are the most powerful means of strengthening the perceptual component without which productive thinking is impossible in any field of endeavor."[14]

That there are larger conceptions of literacy than the exclusively verbal one is also affirmed by the growth of the movement concerned with *visual* literacy. Its advocates represent fields that are either specialized in confronting problems related to reading and learning, such as working with deaf populations, or in fields that stress visual image making, such as the media, graphics, or the fine arts. Their efforts have concentrated upon culling from the research literature those citations which affirm a broader definition of literacy and which connect seeing, listening, perception, cognition, and the various symbolic modes into a more complex fabric of the mind. They stress the educational significance of their attempts to enlarge the structure of "reading" and literacy. "Visual languaging provides new opportunities for cognitive and conceptual development. On the basis of visual languaging competencies, higher development of traditional verbal competencies is possible."[15] The visual literacy advocates take pains to call our attention to some remarkable data. They indicate that the Stanford-Binet I.Q. scores for the pre-school populations have risen significantly since 1947, a year noted for the widespread introduction of television into American homes. Furthermore, the test items that mark the most appreciable increases are the visual and non-verbal items. That score rise is sustained only until age 5.5 at which time, as we all know, children are subject to the commencement of stringent reading training. They go on to show that seventeen years after 1947, in 1964, we see the beginning of the SAT score decline.

One can conjecture some interesting correlations. As TV and movies begin to reach the young in significant numbers, certain I.Q. scores increase, suggesting the positive stimulation of visual media. At the same time, because S.A.T. scores continue to measure verbal skills, we note a decline in those skills in a population whose "literacy" has eroded in the purely verbal area and is possibly being replaced by a larger, visual literacy.[16] What are we to make of this? There is the possibility of a generation gap. We may be standing at a historical watershed, like those decades when equestrianism gave way to automotive transportation. Are we per-

sisting to stress anachronistic levels of skills in historically declining modes of communication? Could we return to the age of elegant language found in the letter writing of the 19th century, even if we wanted to? Might we not do better to begin a rigorous examination of the dominant modes of contemporary communication, whatever they are, by which our children and our students are in fact learning? I am sure that in 1800 it was unimaginable that competent horsemanship would someday be an anachronism for those who needed to travel. Yet, it was the very increase in the demands for travel that hastened the evolution of more "efficient" modes of transportation, replacing the horse and horse carriage with the railroad, and the railroad with the automobile and the airplane.

If the issue of basic skills is about communication, then given the information "explosion" and the new, universally available information technologies, different modes of literacy and languaging must be taken far more seriously. Yet there remains much to learn about cognitive functions and the symbolic processes. What do we need to know in order to better comprehend the nature of the linkages between cognition, the arts and the other languages? I suggest at least five issues which give research focus: *transfer and transformation, cognitive growth, symbolic processing and meaning, the nature of perception,* and *artistic/aesthetic cognition.* The question of *transfer* has never been adequately addressed. Even when we find positive correlations between non-verbal manipulations such as visual art production or music listening and mathematical ability, we have no clear notion of how, if any, transfer is effected. We need to know what the transformational processes are that link thinking, perceiving, knowing, and expression in the various symbolic codes. We need to know about the character of the transition in internal representation, the representational shifts and multiple descriptions that constitute thinking and expression. We ought to understand much better than we do such notions as correctness, aptness, fittingness as criteria of the transformational process. In the cognitive process, what is the catalytic agent that stimulates the crystallization of image and idea? We tend to bifurcate cognitive capacity and functioning with symbolic skill, stressing one and assuming the existence of the other. Yet, we do not understand how capacity in symbolic codes—skill, talent, coordination, genius, etc.—is the consequence of cognitive functioning.

Much has been made of Piaget's stages of *cognitive growth.* Howard Gardner's research suggests that stage sequences in aesthetic comprehension do not parallel those of Piaget. However, important questions remain. Because Piaget considered the

logicomathematical modes primarily, it is by no means clear what the range of developmental modes are and what they tell us about the acquisition of artistic/aesthetic competence, as distinct from visual/aural discrimination skills. In fact, we must ask if the stage concept is applicable to artistic development at all. We have discerned significant eidetic skills in the young which seem to become outgrown and neglected. What are these eidetic skills, and how can they be explained within cognitive theory? What does the developmental theory of linguistics, information processing, and visual perception suggest are the interconnections?

The third issue pertains to the *symbolic processes* themselves. We need to know more about how we derive meaning from the code; that is, an epistemology of symbolic forms as the extension, or consequence, of mental processes. Art history has traditionally delved into the connections between the formal and iconographic;

that is, between style and content. Symbolically, the formal and stylistic are a part of the meaning, or content, of the work. But we do not fully understand how the cognitive structures manifest themselves, or how we perceive meaning in the formal dimensions of the work of art. Another way of looking at this question is to discern the connections between the "truth" value of the artistic symbol and its aesthetic content. We know very little of the algorithms and heuristics in the construction of meaning, particularly in the context of artistic modes. Do terms like syntactic and semantic have relevance to non-verbal codes, like dance or music? We need to understand much more about the various kinds of knowing possible through the arts. The age-old distinction between emotion and reason is constantly re-nurtured through the arts, inasmuch as the arts are readily identified as symbolic carriers of emotional content. Knowing in what ways such emotional content is cognitive would go a long way toward illuminating the nature of meaning in artistic symbolic forms. We should investigate further the cognitive continuity between alphabetic, syllabic, logographic, ideographic, iconographic morphemes in writing systems that lead to, as they once derived from, non-verbal and expressive symbolic codes.

Though there exists a fairly extensive literature of *perception* research, and indeed such research plays a major role in the cognitive theory field, there too many questions remain unanswered. What does research in perception tell us about the arts? What can we learn from auditory and visual perception as active/creative mental activities that inform the development of a cognitive theory of the arts? What do we really know about such perceptive terms and concepts as illusion, representation, imitation, image, and sensation?

Most research in recent years which can be subsumed under the label of cognitive has also stressed the language-mind connection, using verbal modes as behavioral indices of mental functioning. In order to establish the legitimacy of the arts-as-basic-skills claim, a more solid foundation of theory must be constructed which cements the *cognitive* process with the artistic/aesthetic mode of symbolization. Such questions as those pertaining to creativity, learning, problem-solving, inventing, composing, constructing, and designing in the arts must have more adequate explanations within the context of how the mind generates behavior. When speaking of artistic activity terms such as performance, production, appreciation, understanding, and creation come to mind. We need to know in what ways such activities are cognitive. We need to understand the nature of artistic intelligence. It should be pointed out that the

need for an enlarged notion of cognition is not solely the concern of the arts education community. Many scientists note the importance of various modes of thought and the significance of nonverbal, artistic mental processes which inform and are structured by the mind. Eugene Ferguson concludes:

> Much of the creative thought of the designers of our technological world is non-verbal, not easily reducible to works; its language is an object or a picture of a visual image in the mind. It is out of this kind of thinking that the clock, printing press, and snowmobile have arisen. Technologists, converting their nonverbal knowledge into objects directly (as when an artisan fashioned an American ax) or into drawings that have enabled others to build what was in their minds have chosen the shape and many of the qualities of our man-made surroundings. This intellectual component of technology, which is non-literary and nonscientific, has been generally unnoticed because its origins lie in art and not in science.[17]

It is a grave mistake to see the arts as nothing more than ornament, entertainment, cultural enrichment, emotional expression, or the arcane objects and experiences of an elite connoisseurship. The fact is that the arts are about what we know; they are about knowledge. They are symbolic forms which say very important things to us. It is not their pleasantness which makes them essential to our lives. It is their essence; that is, the information which they contain. I do not mean only the representational art of Leonardo's *Mona Lisa, Whistler's Mother,* or Michaelangelo's *Last Judgement.* I do not mean only *Peter and the Wolf,* charming as that story may be. I do not mean only the annual attendance at ballet performances of the *Nutcracker.* I mean the arts at their most obscure and difficult as well as most obvious and popular. I mean the arts strange and remote, as well as the arts which bombard us from TV and magazines. We are surrounded by the arts to such an extent that were all the arts miraculously lifted from our world and our experience, we would be cast into a mental and physical solitary confinement worse than any prison. We would be reduced to mindless ignorance about ourselves, our society, our world, our reality, our beliefs, faiths, and our imagination.

Our physical well being, indeed our very life, depends upon the blood that flows within us. Yet, we mostly think about blood only when we bleed. At least then, we realize its essential nature. The arts are also the blood of our civilized beings. Their flow binds us together, informs us of ourselves, and makes thinking possible, no less than the language of our daily use.

248

REFERENCES

1. Elliott W. Eisner, "The Impoverished Mind" *Educational Leadership*, May 1978, pp. 615-623.
2. T.S. Eliot, *The Hollow Men*, 1936.
3. David R. Olsen, *From Utterance to Text: The Bias of Language in Speech and Writing*, Paper presented to Epistemics meeting at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., Feb. 1974.
4. *Op. cit.*, p. 12.
5. *Op. cit.*, p. 13.
6. Elliot W. Eisner, ed., *Reading, the Arts, and the Creation of Meaning*, Washington: NAEA, 1978, p. 7.
7. *Op. cit.*, p. 7.
8. *Ibid.*
9. Rawley A. Silver, *Developing Cognitive and Creative Skills Through Art*, Baltimore: University Park Press, 1978, p. 5.
10. *Op. cit.*, p. 16 ff.
11. *Op. cit.*, p. 117.
12. *Op. cit.*, p. 119.
13. Rudolf Arnheim, *Art and Visual Perception*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954.
14. Rudolf Arnheim, Visual Thinking, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
15. John L. Debes, Clarence M. Williams, *Visual Literacy, Languaging, and Learning*, Washington, D.C.: The Visual Literacy Center, Gallaudet College, 1978.
16. *Op. cit.*
17. Eugene S. Ferguson, "The Mind's Eye: Non-Verbal Thought in Technology," *Science* 197-4306, Aug. 1977, pp. 827-836.

HOW BASIC IS AESTHETIC EDUCATION? OR IS 'RT THE FOURTH R?*

HARRY S. BROUDY
University of Illinois

EDITOR'S NOTE:
A key to the proper functioning of the arts in the curriculum is an appreciation of the unique consequences afforded by exposure to and experience in the arts. Harry Broudy provides approbation for the arts and aesthetic education to the extent that it can clarify and enrich experience in ways which other subject areas cannot. Basic to the educated life and mind, aesthetic experience gives expressive form to the life around us and makes it vivid and intense, thus creating a foundation for significant cognition, judgment, and action.

---

*Harry S. Broudy. "How Basic is Aesthetic Education? Or Is 'Rt the Fourth R?" *Educational Leadership* 35(2): 134-41; November 1977. Reprinted with permission of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and Harry S. Broudy. Copyright © 1977 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.

My views on education have remained on the dull side responding with caution to innovations that have generated wave after wave of excitement, each of about five years duration. There have been at least three such flood tides in the last 15 years: the pursuit of academic excellence for the elites in the first five; relating compassionately to the disadvantaged in the second five; and basics for everyone in the third. However, we have learned that curricula, texts, the minds of teachers, and the methods of teaching, let alone the real, albeit often subconscious, expectations of the public do not change so fast.

You will understand my uneasiness, therefore, at hearing that arts education/aesthetic education was to be promoted as part of the return to the basics. Were the arts to be sold by trading on the public's demands for instruction in reading? Were we to capitalize on the ambiguities in the meaning of "basics" to change the public's perception of the arts programs from a pleasant frill to a stern necessity?

Understandably, some advocates of aesthetic education or arts education want to take advantage of the current popularity of the basics. The arts did not share in the surge to curricular excellence of the early 60s, nor did they cash in on the wave of compassion that characterized educational reform in the late 60s. They are hoping for better luck if they can march under the banner of basics for everyone of the 70s. For one thing, if the arts could be included among the basics, they would no longer be dropped from the curriculum at the first budget pinch. For another, the mandating of competence in reading as a requirement for exit from schooling and the interest of the federal funding agencies make the basics not only an educational bandwagon but a possible money wagon as well.

There is nothing wrong with being alert to financial opportunity. Arts education needs all the help it can get—to survive, let alone flourish—but in the long run honesty is the safest as well as the best policy, and honesty counsels a careful examination of the senses in which arts education is basic and what can reasonably be promised by the school if it is so regarded.[1]

ART EDUCATION AS A MOTIVATOR

First of all, how valid is the claim that learning how to draw, sing, paint, dance, and write poetry will improve reading scores or scores in arithmetic and penmanship? We are already being told about studies that make claims of this sort, and the alleged

improvement is explained in one or both of two ways. One explanation is that scores in the three r's rise because experience with the arts improve the attitude toward schooling; art activities are interesting, turn pupils on, and are more concrete than bookish studies. This improvement in motivation, it is hypothesized, carries over to other phases of school work. Because discipline is so closely related to motivation, anything that promises to capture attention and maintain interest is always welcomed by schoolkeepers. The second explanation invokes the hypothesis that work in the arts improves the perceptual powers and psychomotor dexterity, and that this transfers to analogous operations in reading, writing, and possibly computation.

I have no evidence for or against these hypotheses, but granting for the sake of the argument, that they have some plausibility, it would take a very impressive improvement in the three r's and a very tight correlation of it with work in the arts to warrant the costs in time and money of an arts education program. More time spent on the three r's with the employment of appropriate electronic technology and behavior modification devices would achieve the desired results more cheaply and more reliably, albeit less pleasantly, and at a serious cost to other educational values.

58

The aesthetic educational program can make a few points by claiming to be a bit of jam that makes the dry study of the three r's more palatable, but I regard this as a weak reason for the program, and I fear that school boards feel the same way. The aesthetic education program must make its case on its contribution to aesthetic values and the value of aesthetic values and not on its putative non-aesthetic spinoffs.

ART AS THE FOURTH R

A second argument for regarding the arts education program as one of the basics is that it is in fact a fourth r. If reading and arithmetic are codes or languages in which ideas are stored, so to speak, then one might also think of the artistic skills as learning the codes by which one penetrates the realm of ideas and feelings in the form of images in various media. It is in this sense that one refers to the "languages of the arts." Thus the skills of artistic impression are compared to the skills of reading, and the skills of artistic expression presumably correspond to the skills of writing. The analogy holds pretty well for the making of art objects, especially when technical standards are important. When they are not, messing around with clay, paint, sounds, gestures, requires no special skill or skill training, and the skill analogy is weakened.

Similarly, the skills of impression require no special training so long as the commerce is with the popular arts. One learns to perceive them adequately and to respond to them properly by sharing the enthusiasm of the peer group for whatever music, fiction, drama, or movie happens to be the rage at the moment. This shared enthusiasm guarantees concentrated attention to and incessant repetition of the content, forms, and norms of popular arts. Appreciation results, as a rule, without the benefit of formal instruction.

Nor are special programs of formal instruction necessary for the perception of everyday aesthetic objects such as scenery, facial expressions, modes of speech and dress, landscaping, and interior decoration. There is a conventional version of what is aesthetically appropriate in these fields, and anyone can learn it from the advertising media. We learn informally the standard images of luxury, expensiveness, elegance and their opposites. How our emotions are supposed to be expressed conventionally in speech, music, and gesture are also learned informally. We rely heavily on the popular arts to show us the forms that our feelings are expected to exhibit.

There is an important difference between the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic, on the one hand, and those of aesthetic impression and expression, on the other. The former are abstract in that c-a-t, e.g., does not smell, sound, feel, or look like a real cat. The symbol is conventional and to the learner arbitrary; no amount of direct experience with cats would suggest it, any more than it would suggest K-a-t-z or c-h-a-t.[2] So somebody has to take the time and trouble to reveal the connection between symbol and thing. In spoken language this pointing out occurs by naming of objects by adults, but even more one learns what stands for what in common action where objects and their speech names occur simultaneously. In mathematics, of course, the level of abstraction is even more of an obstacle to informal learning; beyond counting, ordinary speech does not reveal the operations by which the number system relates the concepts of quantity.

The arts are not codes in this sense and certainly not abstract codes, although on occasion they use symbols that have to be learned (for example, many of the religious symbols used in painting and poetry). On the contrary, the arts present us with *images* of thought and feeling that in some way *are* what they symbolize: the picture of an angry sea *looks* angry, and sad music *sounds* sad, just as a dark, cloudy sky *looks* threatening.

A work of art should communicate, of whatever it is the image, without footnotes or explanations, but some serious art does not.

This happens when the work of art uses images with which we are not familiar. Some of the religious art of previous centuries falls into this category. In literary works, the language of another period may stand in the way of immediate response, for example, the language of Chaucer and at times even of Shakespeare and Milton. More important obstacles to perception are abrupt changes in style. Highly abstract painting or musical composition, for example, baffle us if we are expecting the more conventional forms. Many movie goers are troubled by films that have no discernible plot or that have no distinguishable beginning, middle, and ending. Some contemporary fiction presents similar difficulties. Because serious art does not engage large portions of the population intensively as does popular art, new styles and new forms are not learned by constant repetition and shared enthusiasm. Often only a small coterie of artists are sensitive to some of the experiments being carried on in the studies. For those who do not belong to the coteries of the art world (past or present) a product of that world is a stranger whose character has to be learned; it is not written simply on his face.

60

The vibrations emanating from an orchestra playing avant-garde music are the same for all normal ears, but what is heard depends on the patterns into which the incoming stimuli are sorted, and the sorting is quite different for those who are familiar with the principles of atonal or aleatory composition than for those who are not. To those unfamiliar with the more experimental forms of the modern art film, the succession of images is episodic, disorganized, and disturbing. By the afficianado of modern film festivals, the images are combined and judged differently. Similar observations hold for avant-garde fiction, drama, and dance.

While modern experimental art forms present the greatest difficulty to the uninitiated, even familiar classical art is not equally accessible to all. The viewer or participant may not be tuned to the style of a bygone era or the techniques of a particular period. But with any art, the naive observer fails to perceive more than a small fraction of what is contained in the work: its sensory variations; its formal properties, and the sublety of the feelings that it objectifies in an image. From the artist's point of view, he sees or hears the wrong things.

It is precisely these properties that the skills of aesthetic impression render perceptible, and the more these skills are perfected the greater the chance that the impact of the work of art will approach that which it has on those who have devoted themselves to serious art with the ardor that the young bestow on the latest slang or rock group sensation.

Less need be said here about the skills of aesthetic expression because most arts programs concentrate on them. Two points, however, are relevant. First, early work in this area (K-6) is for the most part making objects in the various media in the hope that the artistic skill thereby attained will continue to be used in later life. For those with talent and persistence this is a fairly reliable prediction; for most of the school and adult population it is not, although leniency with respect to technical standards has encouraged Sunday painters and late evening poets to keep on expressing themselves. For most adults, media other then ordinary language are abandoned as means of expression, even as amateurs. Second, the traditional emphasis on the skills of expression has not succeeded in moving such programs from the periphery of the curriculum to its center.

Nevertheless, performance activity in various media is probably a necessary condition for acquiring the skills of impression, because so much of proper aesthetic perception depends on familiarity with the expressive potentialities of paint, clay, sound, gesture, etc., but the more the program is confined to these activities, the less likely will it be seen as a basic study that ought to be required of everyone and more as a pleasant diversion or professional preparation.

62

One can speak properly about basic skills of aesthetic impression and expression. This claim, it seems to me, is legitimate, but whether it will be honored in the curriculum depends on the value ascribed to aesthetic experience.

THE RIGHT RELATION TO THE 3 R'S

There is an important relation between the three r's and the aesthetic skills, but it is not their correlation with test scores on the mechanics of reading or computation. Suppose we read "This is the forest primeval/The murmuring pines and the hemlocks." What is a forest? A park, a grove of trees, tall trees, scraggly ones? The image to be conjured up is a forest that contains at least some pines and hemlocks. They are very old, and they are murmuring. What are they murmuring? Is there a wind that makes them murmur? What is primeval? How much of the necessary imagery depends upon the mechanical skill of reading? How much on the stirring up of images, ideas, and meanings deposited into our experience from birth on?

But we don't have to rely on examples from poetry. Beyond the simplest forms of naming: "This is a tree," "This is a cow," "A cow gives milk," "This is milk," all discourse depends on the participants

instating a relevant context of meaning. That context originally is built up of visual, tactile, olfactory, auditory images. Long before we know the definition of a shifty character, we have the image of a shifty face. Fairy tales, movies, television—virtually all experience—have built in us an imagic store.[3] Logic and science refines these contents into more precise concepts and relationships, but without the images, the terms are bare formula—a kind of imperfect computer language far removed from human discourse. Consider, for example, how persons using different imagic contexts would construe the sentence: "We are working around the clock." We read with our imagination.

When it is reported that high school graduates can't read, the public is shocked but perhaps not for the proper reasons. There are at least two proper reasons: one is that the nonreaders lack access to the meanings encased in written language; the other is that the imagic store of the nonreaders is impoverished and therewith their resources for interpretation and comprehension. As to improper reasons, I would suggest inability to read want ads, utility bills, and business letters. Useful as these operations are, they do not require the maintenance of a public school system; to make them the criteria for even minimum proficiency is a declaration of bankruptcy by the public school.

IS AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE BASIC?

There is a more significant meaning of basic, however, on which arts education/aesthetic education should be tested and on which its claims should be argued. Granted there are aesthetic skills, how basic in the sense of being foundational or important, is the aesthetic experience to which the skills are instrumental? It seems to me that this is the sense of basic that is being denied when the arts program is regarded as a peripheral luxury rather than a central necessity. When a school board wipes out or materially reduces the program, it is not denying that there are artistic skills. Nor are the members saying that aesthetic experience is undesirable. On the contrary, they are unstinting in their respect for and praise of the arts. But they are saying with their pocketbooks that this kind of experience is not indispensable to the education of the total school population. If we cannot dispute this belief, we shall wage the battle for the arts program without convincing the public, and perhaps not even ourselves.

Aesthetic experience is basic because it is a primary form of experience on which all cognition, judgment, and action depend. It is the fundamental and distinctive power or image making by the

imagination. It furnishes the raw material for concepts and ideals, for creating a world of possibility. Theologically it may be true that in the beginning was the word, but historically it was probably the image or a word-image that came first. Certainly the story of the creation is itself primarily a mighty image.

The source of meaning and its exfoliation into ideas, theories, values, visions, plans, and invention is the imagination. It is the matrix and motivator of all that is characteristically human. Dampen image making, and image perceiving and creating are diminished, and intelligence itself is deflated. This is as true in everyday knowing, thinking, feeling, and choosing as it is in the highest reaches of science and art. Madison Avenue understands this; every successful politician takes advantage of images; every enterprise depends on it. Yet the curriculum of the school does not reflect the centrality of aesthetic experience. Or, what may be even more strange, the development of the imagination is left to chance, as if it were a wayward divertissement in the life of the mind.

The case for arts education depends on what art can do to clarify and enrich experience that the other subjects in the curriculum cannot. Roughly, art is to feeling what science is to thought. Science restructures ordinary experience by imposing theoretical form on it. When, for example, burning is explained by chemistry, an everyday phenomenon is seen in a way that connects it with a vast range of phenomena that in ordinary life do not seem to be related at all, e.g., rusting of iron and the death of fish at certain seasons in lakes near nuclear reactors.

Science tells us that the thorns protect the rose from certain insects; this makes the existence of thorns intelligible. In one of Robert Burns' poems, a lover, says "You stole the rose and left the thorn." ("The Rose and the Thorn") How many thousands of lines of psychological analysis would it take to clarify the feeling expressed in this metaphor? What would our vigorous politicians, business men, and bureaucrats do for clarification of their mission without the metaphors of war and sport—target, task force, contingency planning, bucking the line, holding the fort, running interference, etc.?

Art orders feeling by giving it an expressive form perceptible by the senses—an image. When Dante has Virgil say "The redeemed are seen, rank on rank, as the petals of the divine rose," it is the artist bringing to eye and ear what literally cannot be seen or heard, namely, the essence of Christian theology.[4] Popular art is witness to the unremitting desire to clarify feeling by expressing it in an image. Acting out our feelings—running from danger, striking the

56/0

enemy, taking the drug—does not clarify them; science tells us *why* we have them but not what they mean—only the image supplied by art does that.

Serious art does in a highly refined and concentrated way what popular art does without conscious tuition. But it explores possibilities of feeling that extend far beyond the routinized experience of everyday life. Popular art (popular music, the soap operas,) portrays the feelings large numbers now share: serious art creates images of feeling that we may have not yet brought to consciousness, sometimes by making the strange familiar; sometimes by making the familiar strange.

THE SCHOOL AND AESTHETIC SKILLS

That the aesthetic experience has intrinsic value, that beauty is its own excuse, are valid reasons for making the arts a part of our lives. But they do not prove that schooling in the arts is either basic or necessary. It is basic if we can show that the aesthetic response is indispensable to all experience and that instruction in the aesthetic response is both possible and necessary. We can, I believe, defend both of these theses.

However, two views currently and widely held are almost certain to undercut the argument for formal instruction in the aesthetic skills. One is that in the aesthetic domain anything goes, and that there is no ascertainable difference between popular and serious art. If this is so, schools, it will be argued, will not and should not devote their resources to making happen what will happen anyway. The other is that if the young are sufficiently exposed to "good" art and artists, the goals of aesthetic education—activity and appreciation—will be achieved. Perhaps they will. Let us go further and say that given enough exposure, they almost certainly will. But this is not so much an argument for an arts program in the schools as for supporting museums, libraries, community projects, and the mass media. It is up to us to show that the aesthetic experience is basic to the educated life and mind, and that only the school can provide entry skills into this domain as it can in others.

We can demystify aesthetic instruction without destroying the mystique of art, if we concentrate on the skills of aesthetic perception, namely, the skills of aesthetic expression and impression. We can improve the sensitivity of the learner (any educated learner) to the aesthetic properties of objects. In the earlier grades this can be done in connection with manipulation of materials in the various media; later more demonstrations and analysis can be used.[5] The important point is that it can be done systematically with students

not endowed with unusual artistic talent. These skills will not turn the pupil into an artist nor an enlightened critic, but it will give the confidence that one is seeing, hearing, imagining somewhat as the artist does. Perhaps this is not all we would wish aesthetic education to accomplish, but anything less is probably not worth the resources we are seeking, and anything more depends on our doing at least this much—the basics—well.

REFERENCES

1. The plight of arts education programs is puzzling in the face of the unprecedented popularity of serious art. Museums, dance companies, and symphony orchestras are drawing crowds. Art objects are sought for investment and are the targets of the better class of burglars. But the anomaly can be explained if the public believes that appreciation of art is a wholly subjective, mystical matter to which instruction is irrelevant and/or that exposure to art is all that arts education requires. Ironically, some of the most devoted advocates of arts education have fostered these beliefs, which are good arguments for schools staying out of formal arts instruction.
2. This would not be so true for symbols that do resemble their objects.
3. H.S. Broudy, "Research into Imagic Association and Cognitive Interpretation," *Research in the Teaching of English*, Vol. 7, No. 2, Fall 1973, pp. 240-259.
4. "In Form, then, of a white rose displayed itself to me that sacred soldiery which in his blood Christ made his spouse . . ." *Paradiso*, Canto XXXI.
5. I have elaborated on this approach in numerous papers and in *Enlightened Cherishing: An Essay on Aesthetic Education*, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1972.

CONSERVATIVE INFLUENCES ON THE ARTS IN EDUCATION*

ELLIOT W. EISNER
Stanford University

EDITOR'S NOTE:
To understand the ways in which the arts are viewed by parents, teachers, and school administrators is to better understand why the arts have played second fiddle in the curriculum. Eisner shares his vivid image of what the schools should be like and why they are not so, elucidating the conception of mind and purposes of schooling which makes our educational system an insular one. Eisner demonstrates the critical linkage between school curriculum and college admissions which keeps the arts in a handmaiden role. But he also offers hope that by marshalling new evidence on human development and by creating professional coalitions of broader scope and effectiveness, we can attain for the arts the centrality to which they are entitled.

---

*This is a modified version of a paper, "Implications of the New Educational Conservatism for the Future of the Arts in Education," which appeared in Eisner's book, *The Arts, Education, and Human Development* (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1976.)

57/a

The images people hold for schools influence the kind of place school is for the children who attend it. The kind of school I want for my children would be a place that has a sense of intellectual excitement. Things would be happening there. When I enter that school I want to gradually hear a quartet playing in the corner of the building, like the wafts of freshly baked bread, its aromatic quality permeating the atmosphere. Children would be moving about, some intent on projects that had captured their imaginations. Others would be working in small groups, collaborating on an experiment in science, engaging in a debate about a fine point in a book about social justice and fair play, others reading quietly alone, transported to another place, another time. Engagement, that's the quality that pervades this school, immersion in activities that have deep, personal meaning.

The school I would like my children to attend would have an array of cozy places, small nooks and crannies in which small children could hide, medium children could share, and big children could protect, places that kids could make their own, on which they could stamp their own personalities, imprint their own signatures. Private places are important; this school would have them.

The school I would like my children to attend would be a visual delight. Paintings, sculpture, prints, and murals would vitalize the spaces. Paint splattered kids would provide evidence of people literally into their work. Walls would shimmer with the profusion of color and form of work in progress. Unfinished paintings would not signify disinterest but rather complex problems still to be resolved—the subtle aroma of casein and linseed oil and turpentine would make a fine partner to the counterpoint of a quartet or a cool rock transition coming from the space down the way. What we have in this school, this place of life, is a center of human enterprise, a mixture of energy and imagination, a treat for the senses, a celebration of the mind, a realization of the curiosity, the power, and the competence of growing young minds.

Teachers would be around this school—and because it's the kind of place it is, they would really be in touch with the kids as people. What is even more important, the kids would know the teachers as people and not need to play roles, wrapping themselves in tin foil, providing a cardboard image "to the professional staff." How skillfully the young learn to play the games of adults! How competently they learn to camouflage their feelings, to feign enthusiasm, to provide compliance, to read the system, and to play by the rules, even at times when those rules engender meaning-

57/6

less charades! In this school children have genuine educational options; they are encouraged to cultivate their interests deeply, to pursue ambitions, to devote their attention to problems, projects, and ideas that win their interest. This school provides both the physical space and the psychological space for emerging interests to be pursued. Perhaps that's why you will seldom find the entire class working on one project or topic or lesson. There are times when the class functions as a community, but more often it is natural for small groups to form. Interested children develop interests; time is organic rather than mechanical, body time rather than clock time determines the pace and length of activities. The ebb and flow of interests and work set the pace for life in school. And when groups are formed around interests, interests rather than age or grade level become the basis for grouping. The young can learn from each other as well as from books and teachers.

The school I would like my children to attend would take seriously the idea that human beings, regardless of their reading or math abilities, are inherently worthwhile, that life is precious and that people need not be measured on a common scale. Differences can be valuable, and competencies develop at different rates and in different forms for different people. This means in practice that what each youngster does will be recognized and, when appropriate, honored. Over in the corner of the room sits Daniel. His ability to read is less developed than most of his age mates, but that fact is not a source of discomfort or stigma. What is important is that as he engages himself in projects that are significant to him, that really touch his core, his need to read will be kindled and his ability to read will be fostered. Daniel is quick-witted, has the best sense of humor in the class, and he has as much independence and social competence as almost any kid in school. Daniel is seven.

The school I would like my children to attend would have stage crews building scenery and dance troupes creating choreography. Musical compositions for tape recorder, rubberband strings, and ashcan percussion would be created by composers in residence—Jeff and Trude, ages 9 and 12—to be performed by three 10 year old virtuosi on tape recorder, rubberband strings, and ashcan percussion in the presence of the resident critic, Eileen, who in the school paper critiques this new composition with two earlier ones performed the previous week. In this school the arts are important, the imagination is cultivated, and competence respected. In this school the arts emerge in a natural way; they suit the structure; they relate organically to the life of the place. Could any school have it otherwise?

57/C

The answer to that question is yes! Very few schools approximate the image I have sketched. Most schools—indeed the overwhelming majority—operate in an organizational structure that makes it difficult to adapt to the organic and changing interests of children or to allow for the development of intellectual or aesthetic commitment. The sport of chastizing schools is not new. The spate of books and articles published in the past several years provides abundant testimony to that fact.

I wish I could say that the picture, at least for the short term—the next two or three years—looks better. I wish I could say that as a result of my travels, my observations of the national educational scene, my conversations with school superintendents, specialists in early childhood education and teachers, I foresee a different future for the arts in education. I do not. What I see at present is a growing rise of educational conservatism, a back to basics movement with basics defined as they have been traditionally defined—reading, writing, and arithmetic. At the secondary level basics also include discipline; not the discipline of anthropology, history, psychology, cinematography, or the playing of the English oboe, but discipline in the old-fashioned sense. Parents seem to want the schools to keep the young under control. In Palo Alto, California, for example, an educationally enlightened community, parents recently rated discipline among the highest of priorities for junior high school students.

Vandalism in schools is increasing; some children and adolescents apparently are hostile towards the school; more windows are being broken, equipment "ripped off", and teachers threatened. So as every decent, well-brought-up citizen knows, the way to cure that is through more discipline. Right?

We read in the newspaper that children cannot do math any more. The new math—it's the culprit. What's important is not that children understand mathematics but that they learn to compute. And apparently they can't compute as well as they could a decade ago. The remedy being suggested is not to provide more opportunities to develop computational skills; what you do is to decrease the opportunities provided to them to understand mathematics. Somehow with less understanding and more drill things will be better.

I have talked to superintendents of county districts, districts that have 30 or 40 smaller school districts within them. I'm told by one such county superintendent in southern California that he would be surprised if he found as many as 10% of the elementary school teachers teaching social studies any more. Why not? They are so

57/D

preoccupied with reading and arithmetic skills that social studies can claim little space in the curriculum. Reading and arithmetic performance undergo state evaluation. California uses standardized tests to measure achievement in these areas. The evaluation tail, therefore, wags the curriculum. Teachers and principals who know what is to be counted, do what counts. Social studies isn't counted; hence it doesn't count.

I have talked to professors of early childhood education in San Diego, California, and they express concern that the early childhood education program sponsored by the state, endorsed by the General Assembly, and supervised by the State Department of Education is diminishing rather than enhancing the quality of education for young children. What's the problem? Reading and arithmetic are squeezing almost everything else out of the curriculum. Even at the kindergarten level, the book shelf is replacing the playhouse and the dressup corner. The imaginative life will not measure well on state tests. Although the initial legislation for Early Childhood Education provided for attention to the so-called affective side of educational life, the guidelines for state evaluation teams emphasize the so-called cognitive areas. The observation schedules they employ devote a disproportionate amount of space and attention to reading and "cognitive development."[1] The message that comes through quite clearly to teachers and administrators is that if their ECE programs are going to be evaluated positively, early reading and early math must be given priority. The State Department of Education claims evaluation of "affective" areas is difficult; the technology for evaluating the "cognitive" areas is available—hence that is what will be emphasized. The consequences, as one might have predicted, are not surprising. What is measurable is evaluated, and what is evaluated is emphasized.

72

The growing emphasis on measurement has caused such alarm among elementary school principals that their national association devoted an issue of its journal to the theme, "The Myth of Measurability,"[2] an issue that identifies some of the liabilities of guiding educational planning and teaching on the basis of measurable outcomes. It also points out the millions which testing companies make in selling their wares in 19,000 school districts serving 50 million students.

The rise of educational conservatism is not restricted to the public schools. Stanford University—one of the great universities in this country—recently became alarmed about the so-called escalation of grades. Too many students were receiving high grades. The way to correct that is to reinstate the "D."[3] If too many students do

too well, something must be wrong. Right?

Now some might regard what I have been describing as a misreading of the educational scene today and the result of a professional blind spot to the future of the arts in the schools. Is it not true that there is an upsurge of interest in the arts? Arts festivals pop up almost everywhere, and crafts fairs—why, no self-respecting middle class community would be without them. The density of crafts vendors has become so great in Union Square in San Francisco that they are now strictly regulated in setting up their stands. Last year it is estimated that there were 700 million visits to museums in this country.[4] A Harris poll conducted for the Associated Council on the Arts paints a much different picture than the one I described.[5] In that pool of a selected sample of over 3,000 people, it was found that for the California sample, two out of three people favored the teaching of arts courses for credit as a part of the core curriculum, like English and mathematics. A total of 86% said that playing a musical instrument should be taught in schools for credit, 83% thought that drawing, painting, and sculpture should be taught for credit, 77% thought art appreciation should be taught for credit, and 79% said the same for music appreciation.

When asked, 71% of the Californians said that pottery, ceramics, and crafts should be taught for credit, and 69% said that ballet, modern dance, and movement should be taught for credit. 73

The survey also found that 85% of frequent museum attenders had taken arts courses as children or as adolescents, as compared with 50% of those who did not go to museums in the past year. The survey concluded that the arts in education have had an apparent influence on the aesthetic habits of adults.

Armed with this data we might have good grounds for expecting an artistic renaissance in American schools. According to public opinion as polled by Harris, Americans not only value the arts in general and would be willing to pay more taxes to support them, they also value them in the educational programs provided to the young. Why then, given these opinions, has the renaissance not occurred? Why is it that the educational tendencies are toward other goals, other views of what's important? Why is it that in California the number of art supervisors has dropped from 408 in 1967 to 115 in 1973.[6] Today there are less than 50.

There is no single, simple explanation, but there are to my mind some plausible hypotheses.

In the first place, and this may be the most general overall factor, our culture and the culture of much of the western world tend to view the arts as something that is non-intellectual. Art, generically

speaking, is considered the product of talent, something that issues forth from the emotions rather than from the intellect. Since schools and education are by definition concerned with thinking, the arts can only occupy a marginal or peripheral place. Schools are places concerned with works of the mind and not with works of the hand. Schools are places that should cultivate ideas, not images. Schools are places that should focus upon intelligence, thought, cognition; not upon soul, emotion, or imagination. In short, the overriding, general conception of mind and of the school's role in its development is itself parochial and represents a fundamental misconception of what's involved in thinking.

These are harsh words. Is there evidence to support them? One indicator deals with the dichotomy we make in educational jargon between cognition on the one hand and affect on the other. Cognition is supposed to deal with thought, and affect is supposed to deal with feeling. The distinction, once made for heuristic purposes, becomes reified; it becomes real. Psychologists proclaim it; measurement experts operationalize it; and teachers are supposed to emphasize the one but to give at least a passing nod to the other in order to maintain some semblance of balance in the curriculum. Thus in some classrooms cognitive activities take place in the morning and affective activities are left for a part of the afternoon. When is math taught in most elementary schools? When are the visual arts taught? Obviously, if you have to think, the morning is better than the afternoon. In the afternoon children might be tired, and on Friday afternoon, if they are not tired, they are anticipating the week-end break: no better spot for art!

We promulgate insipid conceptions of mind through the concepts we teach in our university textbooks. We continue to use ideas that won't stand analysis but which have been sanctified by "experts" in psychology and education who should know better. As long as the arts are considered enrichment areas in the curriculum, they will be viewed as marginal niceties—good-time friends, but when the chips are down, they will be among the first to fall.

In the second place, we still labor under the illusion that the public views schools as having something to do with education. As everyone knows, schools are educational institutions, places which cultivate people's positive attributes, realize their potentialities, nourish their spirit, liberate their imagination, engender visions of the good life, foster a love of learning, a respect for truth, and a sensitivity to beauty. Or are they? Are these the values that animate our schools and motivate our communities to support them? I doubt

it. Schools are looked upon by most citizens as places to use to get ahead in the world. Schools are the ladders (whether in actuality or in belief) upon which one climbs ahead. Economic mobility and social mobility are largely influenced by how well one does in school and how far one goes. And as more and more people go to school longer and longer, *where* one goes will become as important as *whether* one goes was in previous years. People know that, especially in upper-middleclass, well-manicured, polite communities. Parents in such communities are very interested in how well their kids do in school, and compared to national norms, their kids do well indeed. In general, the children in our communities will be educational winners. They will have access to the college of their parents' choice.

I am suggesting that schools in our society function not so much to cultivate the virtues I described earlier, but rather to select out of the population those who can play the game by the rules through which it functions. That's one of the reasons why upper-middleclass parents are so concerned that their children do well in third year math in high school; it's needed for admission to prestige colleges and universities. I really can't bring myself to believe that parents think sentential calculus will really be more useful in pursuing the good life than in-depth work in one of the arts. When was the last time you inverted a fraction or calculated the truth of a geometric derivative, let alone basked in the memory of a whole, unified, coherent, and moving experience in which those once held skills were acquired? No, we teach what we teach because they are passports through our system, not because we have reflected on the nature of education and judged them necessary.

When schooling becomes a mechanism for economic and social mobility, a number of consequences follow. First, if schools are in the business of selecting the able from the less able, then there cannot be a majority of winners. Selectivity means weeding out as well as screening in. When everybody is somebody, nobody is anybody. Second, if schools are conceived to be productive in the industrial sense, they need a product.[7] That product becomes education. Some get it, others don't. What is more appropriately viewed as a verb—a process to be engaged in, a journey one embarks upon—becomes a noun. Education becomes objectified. Once objectified, it becomes capable of being measured—or so the argument goes. Thus test performance on third-grade state-mandated reading tests and college board exams provide the official index of educational quality.[8] Schools have become institutions at least as much concerned with processing and certifying as they

are concerned with educating. The public knows this. It's not that education in its grandest sense is not valued; it's that given the game, it's not terribly relevant. Education in the grand sense of the word is a leisure time activity. It not only requires a sense of engagement, it takes time. It's to be savored, rolled over the tongue, cherished. We are more concerned with efficiency than with leisure. The instructional engineer, the cost-benefit analyst, the educational accountant: these are the school district's educational specialists. What school district do you know that employs a philosopher of education? This thought alone is enough to raise a smile on one's face.

While the public might prefer a more generous conception of education, at present they realize they cannot afford it. They cannot afford it not in the monetary sense, but in the sense that to provide such an educational environment might jeopardize their children's chances for meeting the criteria by which schools now select and reward.

Consider as an example admission to the University of California. The University of California is the highest prestige public institution in the state. To be admitted to the University of California a student must be in the upper 12% of the class, and must have completed four years of English, two years of a foreign language, two or three years of mathematics, two or three years of science, and three or four years of social studies. These are the required subjects. If a student is educationally ambitious, he or she will take three or four years of science or math, four years of social studies, and three years of foreign language. What remains on the time schedule can then be devoted to the non-essential courses such as the arts. How much data do students and parents need to figure out what counts? The message is clear. It's understood by some parents when they enroll their child in kindergarten.

Thus, let us recognize one of the dominant functions and the pervasive quality of schools. A major function is to certify and to select. What schools produce is "education" according to the limited criteria they invoke. Their pervasive quality frequently borders on the image of the industrial plant: try to find a soft surface in a secondary school. Organizationally they are bureaucratized with growing tendencies toward a form of simplistic accountability that has little or nothing to do with the educational process. Administrators have separated themselves from the teaching profession, and teachers increasingly view administrators as management. Administrators complain about unionization and grumble that the union is not interested in education, only in salaries. Teachers complain that ad-

ministrators do not care about teachers. Administrators are excluded from teachers' unions and teachers excluded from administrators' organizations. Each group defines the other as an adversary. Meanwhile, school boards want to see demonstrated payoffs, and the state legislature in California passes laws designed to improve the quality of education by mandating an evaluation program for all certificated personnel while allocating no funds for this to be done.

I have painted the educational picture in this country in broad strokes as I see it. I have tried to get across the point that the problem of making the arts an equal partner in school curricula will require some fundamental changes in our conception of mind and in the functions we want schools to serve. The root problems are both epistemological and social. Epistemological, because they relate to our narrow conception of what it means to know; social, because schools do not exist in a social vacuum. Their current priorities are reinforced by commercial interests and by institutions of higher education; they are sustained by technically oriented professional educators and psychologists who have made a heavy investment in a set of tools that define education in terms that the tools can treat. In short, the problem of generating an educational environment in which the arts play a significant role is a systemic problem, not a local one; another art or music teacher here or there will not be sufficient.

At the same time I hope I have not projected the feeling of hopelessness. I continue to be optimistic. What *will* lead to hopelessness is a failure to recognize the depth of the problem and the extent to which it is sustained by cultural agencies and vested interests. What *will* lead to hopelessness is our willingness to kid ourselves that a few more art classes will do it. Let us take a leaf out of the arts themselves and pay attention to the entire ground on which our schools participate; let's look at the forest as well as the trees.

I continue to be optimistic because there are things that we can do to bring about change; we have allies. For example, recent work in neuropsychiatry is providing increasing evidence that human consciousness is a function of both of the two hemispheres of the brain? What is lyrical, holistic, synthetic, and metaphorical, what comes to consciousness in the forms of icons or images is largely a product of right hemisphere thinking. Such processes, central to human adaptability and creativity, could be fostered through programs that are genuinely educational. We have an ally in the work being done in this area.

We also have an ally in our potential ability to give the arts a visi-

bility within the school and the community that most other areas do not have. The arts in the school have to be taken out of the classroom and "demonstrated" in the public eye. The hallways, courtyards, auditoriums of our schools and the shopping centers and the universities of our communities—these are the places the arts need to pervade with materials, perhaps in written form, that enable the public to understand what they are about, and what they mean educationally.

Additionally, we can use our own artistic skills to develop the case for arts education by creating portrayals of the arts in the schools that can be shown to school boards, PTA groups, Kiwanis, Rotary, and other such groups that illustrate the contributions of the arts in the educational development of the young.[10] This process could, for example, make use of films, slides, and work samples collected over time that illustrate children's educational development, and videotaped critical analyses of arts teaching that would help lay people begin to understand the kinds of demands, intellectually and aesthetically, that work in the arts exact. We can use tape recorded interviews with students, debriefing them on tape about what they have learned from their work in the arts. We can work at demolishing the myth that the arts are only for the talented or the academically dull.

These efforts, as useful as they might be for increasing the visibility and understanding of the arts in education, will not be adequate. There are several other things that need attention. Those of us who work in one arts area need to establish coalitions with professionals working in other arts areas. Music educators need to work with art educators. Both groups need to work with those in drama, dance, and literature. All of us have a common stake in the arts and share a common belief in their importance in the education of the young. We have so far worked alone, as if the other groups did not exist. That needs to be changed. We badly need to work out plans through which unified and articulated positions can be formulated and then to make our voices heard.

In some cases coalition may lead to the development of transdisciplinary courses in the arts in schools. In other cases it will lead to a stronger educational image and a more powerful political force. We cannot afford the seductive luxury of isolation.

In addition to coalitions we need to locate in the communities within which we work those members of the community who are now responsive to the arts and who value them. We need to identify a constituency. Citizens who now value the arts in their own lives are the most likely to value them in the education of the young.

That constituency could become vocal and could exercise the political clout necessary to persuade school boards that the arts are not frills but central ingredients in the educational process. School boards are responsive to community input as so many communities have already demonstrated. We need such a constituency to serve as advocates for the arts in education.

To insure that citizens do not believe they are jeopardizing their children's educational chances by advocating an adequate role for the arts in the schools, the gateways to college admission need to be broadened. One place to start is with university admission requirements. Imagine the impact on school programs if the University of California required courses in the arts as a condition of admission. Imagine the impact if the College Board Examinations required a portfolio, a recorded musical performance, an original musical composition, a piece of verse, a filmed ballet solo, or the like. We can begin to plan the ways through which the narrow conception of relevant educational experience is broadened so that those who want to work in the arts can do so without jeopardizing their chances for university admission.

I believe it will take a major coordinated, unified effort to engender a paradigm shift in our conception of education. But in the long run, that is what will be necessary. This shift may have modest beginnings, but we should not delude ourselves that either the effort or the goals are modest. They are not. What we seek is a basic, systemic change in thinking about the educational process and the school's function in its pursuit.

REFERENCES

1. These schedules are used by monitor and review teams that visit schools receiving funds from the state of California for early childhood education programs.
2. *The National Elementary Principal,* LIV, March-April 1975.
3. The reinstitution of the D has occurred not only at Stanford University but at a host of other universities concerned with "grade escalation." I have seldom seen a thoughtful educational rationale for this decision.
4. George Goodwin, "The Role of Public Education in Three California Art Museums: A Survey of Trustees' and Staff Members' Views," doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, June 1975.
5. Louis Harris and Associates, *Californians and the Arts,* New York: ACA Publications, 1974.
6. These data were issued by Louis Nash, state consultant in arts education, California State Department of Education, 1975.

7. For a penetrating analysis of the product orientation to schooling, see Ivan Illich, *Tools for Conviviality,* New York: Harper and Row, 1973, *passim.*
8. These scores are frequently published in local newspapers in rank order for each school in a school district.
9. Michael S. Gazzaniga, "The Split Brain in Man," in *The Nature of Human Consciousness,* ed. Robert E. Ornstein, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1973.
10. For an elaboration of artistic approaches to the description of educational outcomes, see Elliot W. Eisner, "Toward a More Adequate Conception of Evaluation in the Arts," *Peabody Journal of Education,* LII, April 1975, 173-179.

BACK TO IMAGES

EDMUND BURKE FELDMAN
University of Georgia

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Human growth depends upon perceptual experience as a foundation for all communication and learning, according to Edmund B. Feldman, who employs ideas from anthropology and linguistics among other disciplines to present his case for the primacy of visual modalities in schooling. The crucial role of images in language development requires seeing art instruction not merely as a basic but perhaps as a "pre-basic." Feldman argues that the extensive and increasing domination of our lives by a visually-based culture compels attention in education to perceptual growth and development, and that historically art provides paradigms for the evolution of those symbol systems around which societies are fashioned. He suggests that basic education could not be more basic than to include art.

The back to basics movement has taken hold so strongly that its crucial term "basic" bids fair to become a cliché. It is not uncommon in the political, social, and educational worlds for potentially useful ideas to be distorted as they become, first, slogans, and then, stereotypes. The word slogan originally meant a war cry, a phrase used by the Scots to stir up their warriors for battle. And at times "basic education" has had that bellicose intention: its adherents may not have loved the Three R's so much as they detested the so-called "frills" that sprouted in the curricular garden. Those frills were increasing like the kudzu grass that spreads so abundantly through Southern fields and hillsides. Kudzu is an ugly vine that grows about fourteen feet a year. It was originally imported to prevent soil erosion; now it promises to swallow up front yards, back yards, tennis courts, and swimming pools. Indeed, we have frantic visions of kudzu taking over the whole environment. However, some food scientists have discovered that it has a fair amount of protein and, when boiled, can be eaten by humans. So there may be some good in kudzu, but I rather doubt that we shall ever be able to build a completely satisfying diet around it. Which is to say that the basics are important if only to prevent the leaching of our educational soil. At the same time, all of us know, including the Council for Basic Education, that schooling must include much more than the Three R's.

Right now, basic education is the bandwagon rolling irresistibly through town, and educators are running as hard as they can to hitch a ride. Obviously, there are far more subjects in the school curriculum than the Three R's. So there isn't enough room for everyone on the bandwagon; but if everything is basic, then nothing is basic. Hence many of us are engaged in searching for reasons why our special areas deserve to be called "basic." That may be more difficult for some disciplines than for others. Teachers of vulnerable subjects may find it necessary to substitute polemics for good reasons, manufacturing spurious "scientific" evidence of learning, and indulging in a certain amount of educational overpromising in a desperate effort to hold a place in the curriculum. In the case of art education, we may resort to some extreme methods of self-defense, like trying to frighten people by telling them that lack of drawing instruction leads to brain damage. A few of us may even conjure up visions of angry adolescents destroying school property because they were denied clay modeling experiences. And our graduate students can be relied on to fashion rationales in which "basic" is used so often as to exhaust our hearers. Some-

times, sheer repetition and the boredom it induces can lead to acquiescence. Thus the word if not the idea "basic" will be neutered, made harmless. Then we shall be able to continue as before.

However, we need not resort to skulduggery to support the educational existence of the visual arts. I believe we can face the issues raised by basic education honestly and (dare one say it?) creatively. So let us take the term "basic" in "basic education" at face value. I think it can be defined as training in the skills that must be mastered before more complex, difficult, applied, vocational, or liberal learning can take place. What I am willing to concede is that there are school subjects which deserve to be called "tool" subjects because their mastery is instrumental or prerequisite to instruction in other studies and activities. Having said this much, all of us who talk about "basics" should heed Alfred North Whitehead's injunction: "The uncritical application of the principle of the necessary antecedence of some subjects to others has, in the hands of dull people with a turn for organization, produced in education the dryness of the Sahara."[1] So let us say this much: the instrumental character of certain subjects at certain times merely recognizes the fact that teaching and learning are predicated on discourse between teachers and pupils who must be able to communicate, to share ideas and information, before further instruction of any sort can take place. Of course our educational discourse does not take place in a semantic vacuum: it always needs to be *about* something. That "something" is the world of people, places, things, and qualities—the world imaged in art. In the lower grades, at least, discourse about nouns and verbs, subjects and predicates, prepositions and adverbs (try defining words of place, time, manner, degree, etc. to children) will not be understood. Children must *see* these relationships before they can use them in speech. And, paradoxically, they must use them before they can "know" what they are doing. What I am leading up to is this: the linguistic abilities of young children have to be learned through work with concrete objects and images—things they can see and touch. This we should have learned from Dr. Montessori. It should be obvious, furthermore, that symbolic communication is not always conducted with verbal language: there are also the symbol systems of art, music, gesture, and dance. Indeed, these are our earliest languages; we learn them before reading and writing.

But if art and music provide a foundation for the teaching of the basics, it is difficult to imagine *instruction* in art or music—or mathematics, for that matter—without speech. That is what basic educationists have seized upon—the necessity of a fundamental lan-

guage, shared by teachers and pupils, that will permit instruction to go forward. However, the problem here is that formal instruction in speaking, reading, and writing—language as a system of abstract codes—cannot be initiated until a foundation has been established for dealing hypothetically, or symbolically, with *basic* concepts of space, time, order, likeness, quantity, size, and so on. Now these basic concepts have to be encountered in real rather than abstract or theoretical contexts. Certain visual images seem to fit this requirement: They are real; they are exciting; they possess a logic that can be read; they are portable and convenient to use; they are cheap; and pupils have been accustomed to them via television and picture books. It is after children have gained experience in reading images that they are ready *to pretend* that letters stand for sounds, words, and ideas. We have it on the word of no less an authority than Whitehead that a Stage of Romance—by which he means "the stage of first apprehension" necessarily precedes the stages of "grammar," "precision," and "generalization."[2] Jerome Bruner, too, posits an iconic or seeing stage as a prerequisite for the symbolic stage of educational development.[3] That is, training in discriminating among sense data, and the acquisition of spatio-temporal concepts, necessarily precede formal instruction in the use of verbal and mathematical languages. Now there's the rub: Instruction in the so-called basics, which are essentially linguistic, cannot take place until a child has passed through Whitehead's "stage of first apprehension," or Bruner's iconic stage. In other words, there is a proto-language that children must learn before they can master the official school languages: speech, reading, and writing. Strange as it sounds, there is a language which is basic to the basics.

That basic language, the language we must learn to use before we can receive instruction in the basics, is inherent to some extent in the people, places, and things we encounter from the day we are born. This amounts to saying that God created a universe with an inherent order we perceive only dimly and imperfectly in infancy. It is interesting, in this connection, that the word "infancy" derives from a root that means the inability to speak—the inability, that is, to notice and express the logic which connects people, places, and things in the world. The ability to speak requires us not only to name things but also to perceive and express their interconnections. As we know, an infant learns first to connect his perceptions of objects with the sounds he can make with his throat, lips, and tongue. But it is rather more difficult to arrange those sounds according to the syntactical order "out there." Happily, there is, in

addition to the order or logic of the things "out there," a fundamentally unlearned capacity in each child to apprehend that logic or syntax and convert it into language. It would seem to follow theologically, if not psychologically, that the God who instituted the syntax of things also equipped human beings to grasp it. Let us suggest at this point, and without irreverence, that the task of reconciling the two languages God created is not miraculously accomplished; it has to be taught. Ideally, it is first taught in the family: there is no better way. In school it becomes the business of teaching in all the arts, although I believe the visual arts have the key role because (a) vision was central in the evolution of *homo sapiens* and (b) children must learn a *discipline of seeing* if they are going to learn to read. Hence I maintain that it is the business of art in early education to help children connect the images of things with words. Later in life (and in school), art will serve other purposes. At the outset, however, we cannot imagine any more urgent—or basic—educational task than employing art to assist children in acquiring the languages of vision, motion, and gesture that enable them to manipulate and represent the world symbolically.

88

In connection with the role of art in early schooling it is interesting that the Commissioner of Education, Ernest Boyer, argues that a Basic School is needed, one in which "it is clear to students that we communicate not just with words, but with music, theater, dance, and the visual arts. Introducing students to the power of these *symbols* [emphasis added] must also be a part of language fundamentals."[4] Taking a similar tack, A.W. Foshay offers a proposal for what he calls "a better sequence" of instruction:

> The proposal proceeds from the principle that one should first become acquainted with reality before attempting to deal with it abstractly. We would begin in the early grades with the realities of the world: the physical realities, the life forms, the human phenomena, art forms. Only after children had an extensive acquaintance with these data would we introduce abstractions of them in the form of the 3 R's.[5]

Foshay and Boyer appear to agree that learning in the basics requires a foundation of learning through the arts. Boyer is impressed with art as a form of communication; Foshay sees art as a source of data about reality. Both realize that the arts bridge the gap between raw experience on the one hand, and such abstract codes as mathematics and literature on the other.

Clearly, my argument for including art among the basics—indeed the pre-basics—hinges on the nature of art as a language. Without

going into the extensive literature in aesthetics and linguistics which deals with this question, let me point out that most people act *as if* art is a language. That is, they respond to works of art as they respond to speech or to writing.[8] People do in fact agree and disagree, admire and dislike, purchase and discard, remember and forget, as a result of their optical intercourse with organized visual signs and symbols. Turning from viewers to those who create visual images, we know that artists work on the assumption that particular combinations of line, shape, color, texture, and so on, are good or bad, pleasing or ugly, effective or ineffective, insofar as they embody their formal, expressive, or practical intentions. Stated otherwise, artists behave *as if* viewers can understand or "read" what they (artists) think they are saying. It may be objected that I use the word "say" in a metaphoric sense when associating it with what artists make. But that is, at bottom, a quibble. After all, the sounds that issue from our throats have only a conventional or arbitrary association with what we feel or think. In fact, the painter's images have a closer connection to reality than a speaker's sounds have to his ideas or emotions.

90

Recalling now that Burner speaks of an iconic stage that precedes the symbolic stage of human development, our practical problem of teaching becomes: How do we help children make the transition from iconic to symbolic? That question can be translated into another question: How do we enable children to deal with the world hypothetically and metaphorically instead of by direct physical action or bodily contact? And you know my answer: we urge them to make visual images, and we teach them to read, that is, respond to the images they and others have made. I call the latter art criticism. This may appear to be special pleading from a teacher of the visual arts. I would argue, however, that a visual-verbal modality—criticism—plays this crucial role in human development and hence in education, because of the crucial role of vision in the evolution of our species. To put the matter in a somewhat oversimplified form, the foundations for the distinctively human development of mankind were established when, about a million and a half years ago, the forepart of the brains and skulls of our hominoid ancestors began to grow explosively to accommodate a large increase in visual function. Probably, the growing dominance of the visual in our dealings with the environment was caused by our earlier adoption of erect posture. What it is important to realize is that the dominance of the visual sense, its steady displacement of the tactile and olfactory, led to the type of mental activity we associate with human thinking and language use: it was seeing—visual

rather than tactile contact with the environment—that enabled human beings to make distinctions between here and there, close and distant, first and last, present and future, real and unreal, actual and potential, concrete and hypothetical, subject and object.

If I am right so far, art is a basic subject because it serves as a pre-lexical, pre-grammatical mode of learning. It enables children to cope with life by using a form-language that their incipient syntactical powers can handle. The reality of the world is rather more complex than children can talk about. This is not entirely due to an inadequate vocabulary of words; it is also due to the fact that children cannot deal with the richness of their experience with the imperfect syntactical equipment they possess. Happily, the *economy* of art, the result of the artistic simplification and generalization of complex visual data, gives the child access to his experience in a form that (a) reduces the "static," the sensory overload of life; and (b) enables him to enlarge his repertoire of symbols and syntactical relations. That repertoire is transferable; it can enhance any child's facility with verbal language. Through art criticism especially, children become conscious of improved verbal capacities; as they search for and discover suitable verbal analogies to the visual forms encountered in artistic images, they give public utterance to their private perceptions and strengthen their sense of language as a system of correspondences between one set of symbols and another. They learn, moreover, that the process of translating from one symbolic language to another generates poetic opportunities. And it is in poetry, not prose, that language is born.

Another way to look at the question of art and the basics is to examine the changing relationship between words—spoken or written—and visual images. For most of our civilized history, the mastery of spoken words (rhetoric) and written words (literature) has been the indispensable key to power and prestige for ambitious men. To be sure, there have always been charismatic personalities, themselves not necessarily lettered, who could hire or compel word-men to do their bidding. But for the most part, persons who knew how to read had access to information that gave them control over those who could not. And for some gifted individuals, reading led to the ability to speak forcefully, compellingly. Finally, the recorded speech of men who were wise, powerful, or successful was embodied in the documents used to govern, not just groups gathered in public squares, but also whole societies—collections of persons widely dispersed in time and space. Indeed, the only thing such groups may have had in common was that they were governed by the same documents. Over a long time, most of

us have been persuaded that it is in the natural order of things for words printed on pieces of paper to guide, if not control, people's lives.

But it must be clear, given the prominence of visual media like television, cinema, and print advertising, that written words no longer enjoy unquestioned control over large-scale human behavior. If we consider the emergence of photography and inexpensive lithographic printing in the 19th century, it appears that a long-smoldering underground struggle has risen to the surface of culture. That struggle—a war between words and images for the possession of the human imagination—has been going on for millenia. It must have begun at the dawn of the Neolithic when our ancestors learned that pictures could be converted into signs, reducing their sensuous vitality but increasing their efficiency and precision of meaning. In our century, the struggle has been intensified by the perfection of printed images, the long-distance transmission of words, the development of electronic imagery, and soon, the application of laser technology to the transmission of words *and* images. But the war of words and images seems to be reaching a conclusion. Although the means of generating, transmitting, storing, and retrieving words grows ever more sophisticated, it is clear that most people prefer images. That is, they want their advanced technologies to be used to generate, transmit, store, and retrieve pictures—moving pictures, if possible. This seems to be the case with the literate as well as the illiterate. It can almost be stated as an axiom: given a choice between words and images as the principle mode of encountering ideas and information, most persons choose images. There are, no doubt, several social and educational reasons why this is so; but there are also impressive economic and technological reasons: inexpensively reproduced and transmitted visual imagery reduces, if it does not entirely eliminate, the competitive advantages of writing. The efficiency of writing in the use of space, time, and materials disappears in the face of cheap electronic communication. As for the logical precision of written messages, it exists in theory but is becoming very rare in fact; hence we can expect it to become exceedingly expensive, as in a well-crafted legal brief, for example. From reading what graduate students write, I am persuaded that the ability to communicate unambiguously, not to say eloquently, with words, is not very widely diffused in the population.

For practical purposes, then, the question about the dominance of words or visual images has been settled: we can see the answer in the growing quantities of space allotted to pictures in books, in

magazines, in print advertising, and in the steady reduction of words in the graphics environment. Certainly, the huge printed letters we see around us function like immense abstract paintings. And many of them have assumed sculptural and architectural identities. We might cite Robert Indiana's architectural treatment of LOVE as a symbol of this process. Another example can be seen in Franz Kline's great black abstractions; it is no accident that some critics see them as blown-up Chinese calligraphic characters. Whether consciously or otherwise, Kline reversed the historic process by which pictures became letters; he recognized the enormous pictorial power of letter forms once they were separated from their conventional verbal-symbolic associations. The restoration of the letter's iconic heritage results in a veritable explosion of energy. This is what is acknowledged, indirectly, by the vigorous gesturing of Abstract Expressionist painting: when visual images and bodily movements are united, we rediscover a syntax that was lost when the priest-scribes of Sumeria codified some ancient pictographic language that everyone could read. Civilization took a great leap forward when our visual and verbal languages were separated. But also, that separation made it possible for a small, educated caste to be rulers in a society whose masses suddenly (historically speaking) found out that they were illiterate.

We can cite one more example of the decline of verbal language—popular vocal music, a form that employs only a few simple words in its songs; and these few are repeated endlessly, almost idiotically. Indeed, many song lyrics have been reduced to grunts; it is sound, not diction, that signifies meaning in popular music. And those sounds are intimately connected to the contorted images of the people who make them. Which is to say that words decline in importance while visual, aural, and kinaesthetic stimuli make progressively larger demands on our attention. This development—the steady reduction of verbal language in popular visual and musical art forms—is probably irreversible. And while it may please some of us to see visual imagery assuming a more prominent role in the worlds of information, communication, and entertainment, we cannot rejoice in the spread of verbal illiteracy. Educators, especially, must recognize that the increased use of visual imagery in the arts of communication, entertainment, and persuasion has not been accompanied by a comparable improvement in the ability of the masses of school graduates to understand what visual images mean.

Summarizing this discussion of art and the basics, I have argued (1) that a logic of images must be mastered by every individual at an

early stage of development; (2) that systematic training in making and reading visual images—in connecting images with words—must precede formal, i.e. abstract, training in reading, writing, and arithmetic; (3) that the general education of all persons—from the elementary school through the university—ought to include instruction in what I call art criticism: the description, analysis, and interpretation of visual images. Henceforth, I believe, effective education at all levels will be increasingly characterized by the use of visual-verbal modalities.

Perhaps the phrase I use as a title, "back to images," will now be seen as more than a slogan, a war cry. I intend it as an ironic parallel to the "back to basics" slogan. If we are really to return to fundamentals in education, then by all means let us return to the perceptual foundations of individual development. But if I insist that those perceptual foundations are predominantly visual, this is not to establish grounds for complacency among art educators. We have not been especially alert to the possibilities of developing the perceptual *and linguistic* foundations of learning. Now, ready or not, that is the task we must undertake. I believe we can do the job and do it well.

REFERENCES

1. Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education*, New York: Mentor Books, 1949, p. 28.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
3. Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education*, New York: Vintage Books, 1963, pp. 33-54.
4. Education Supplement of the *New York Times*, January 1, 1979.
5. Arthur W. Foshay, "Editorial: It Could Work Better," *Educational Leadership*, December 1978, Vol. 36, No. 3, p. 165.
6. *We must remember that printed words are diagrams, that is, abstract images of speech sounds. In this view, printed words are a species of the genus art: both are representational, more or less. However, pictures of things are historically and ontogenetically prior to "pictures" of sounds.

ENHANCING THE AESTHETIC POTENTIAL

VINCENT LANIER
University of Oregon

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Exaggerated claims for the primacy of art education have not advanced its interests in schools, and such claims may have missed altogether the real potential of art for enhancing educational experience. Vincent Lanier prefers to argue for aesthetic experience as a basic facet of schooling as it is throughout our daily lives. But such recognition ought not to be at the expense of discursive language, which will remain the central vehicle for curriculum, a reality which lends itself well to Lanier's emphasis on criticism and the strengthening of appreciational skills along with the art-making experience. By validating our social and cultural lives, art in schools can be a meaningful basic.

Lewis Carroll begins his classic volume for children with the sentence: "Alice was beginning to get very tired of sitting by her sister on the bank, and of having nothing to do: once or twice she had peeped into the book her sister was reading, but it had no pictures or conversations in it, 'and what is the use of a book,' thought Alice, 'without pictures or conversations?' "[1]

Like Alice, art educators today are asserting the importance of their field and attempting to place it at the core of the curriculum rather than the periphery, which is and has been its scholastic position. As an illustration of this attempt, we need look no further than the bumper sticker dispensed by the NAEA which unhesitatingly announces that "Art is Basic." However, at the same time, school districts curtail time and expenditures for the visual arts while increasing both of these allocations for language and mathematics in the interests of emphasis on the so-called basics of education. This squabbling over the basics has generated very little wisdom and considerable confusion. Moreover, in our missionary fervor to obtain a larger share of the curriculum we have both exaggerated and too frequently altered our claims for the beneficient results of instruction in art. We need, in place of these exaggerations and alterations, a rational and defensible claim for the educational value of our field which grows out of its content and supports what is unique about it in human experience.

We have not been helped to restrain these claims by the newest riders on the bandwagon, the arts managers and bureaucrats whose visibility and credibility is far greater than our own. So glamorous are some of the claims for the visual arts of both these groups and our own that their pronouncements suggest that art should not only be "in" the core of the curriculum, but should be the core itself. According to some of these ideas, one might believe that the child who does not spend as much time with clay and paint as with words and numbers becomes a pathetic intellectual cripple, while the child who does so can become a sort of Nietzschean superman. Jacques Barzun put it well when he commented on all of these "inflated" claims at the NAEA meeting in Houston in 1977:

> For the last fifty years, American Education has pursued a policy of overstatement about its role and substance; it has lived by continual exaggeration of what it is for and what it can do. The medium naturally is words, words misunderstood and misapplied—it is verbal inflation . . . . As in the worst sort of advertising, whatever Education offers is said, ahead of time, to be the latest

> and best, most perfect, supreme; the results of its use are glorious, incomparable, magnificent in the literature of Education, what we teach and the benefits that follow are always universal in scope; we acknowledge no limits; we will not tell the truth nor face the simple facts.[2]

One can only hope that Barzun's words will be taken to heart by art educators, but it is unlikely. The point Barzun makes about general education and later in the same article about art education, has been made repeatedly in our own literature, but it has been carefully ignored.[3] One might, of course, suspect that such criticisms are themselves inflated. Unhappily, there is more than adequate evidence to the contrary from some respected and widely available sources. For example, Michael Steveni writes: "Why should one have a separate thing called art education . . . Why indeed?—no other area of knowledge that is instigated as a form of thinking is so all-embracing as the art lesson."[4] Louise Yochim asserts the following:

> To be sure, none will deny that all disciplines play a vital role in the shaping of the human personality. But unfortunately, few recognize that the *integrative aspect is essentially the function of the arts. For, through the arts, man realizes the harmonious orchestration of all his faculties—his tastes, his sensibilities, and his skills. Through the arts, he is better able to penetrate the detailed components of his cosmos. Through the arts, he becomes attuned to the differences and similiarities of man. And finally, through the arts, he stabilizes his emotions, refines his sensitivities, and develops acuteness of perception in the process.*[5]

One recommendation of the Rockefeller Commission Report presents this inflated claim: "The fundamental goals of American education can be realized only when the arts become central to the individual's learning experience, in or out of school and at every stage of life.[6] The second chapter of the 1977 NAEA Commission Report expands the previous point:

> Art Education, the commission believes, can be regarded as THE MOST FUNDAMENTAL ASPECT of a child's intellectual development, a development concerned with moral as well as academic values. For example, the sense of proportion, harmony, beauty, and rightness that work in art makes possible not only provides the basis of what we know, but also of what we value. The conceptual aspects of art helps to form the initial realization, and the expressive aspects cultivate a respect for the quality of action. Neither knowledge nor morality can exist without them.[7]

The popular press echoes these claims:

> For the past decade or so, budget-cutters and back-to-basics zealots have been hacking away at "frills" in America's schools. Inevitably, the arts are among the first victims. But now a countermovement is underway. Important new evidence shows not only that the arts are beneficial in themselves but also that their introduction into a school's curriculum causes marked improvement in math, reading, science, and other subjects that the educationists pronounce "essential." Indeed, some researchers are now saying that the absence of arts programs can retard brain development in children.[8]

The quotations above by no means represent a new stance *vis-à-vis* the teaching of art. One has only to dip back into the history of our field to find parallels:

> . . . It is through drawing, as much as any other subject, that we educate the mind to know, open the mind, aid the memory, cultivate the imagination, and train the judgment and reason. Then creative power, culture, control, confidence, decision, direction of best emotions, harmony, observations, imagination, accuracy, judgment, order, dramatic force, spontaneity, and appreciation, are the results of proper art training.[9]

Like the White Queen in *Alice in Wonderland,* art educators have always had to run as hard as possible simply to stay in place. One wonders if the present rash of grandiloquent claims for the curricular primacy of art will move us any further ahead than our present vulnerable position.

On the other hand, some art educators continue as they have in the past to seize the latest notion or advance in knowledge in a related field as still another rationale for teaching art, without the careful and prolonged consideration such assertions merit. One such recent claim involves split-brain research which indicates that each hemisphere of the brain controls different processes. What the sometimes unrestrained art education advocates of this geographical distribution of brain function neglect is that any kind of complex symbolic activity, whether it is in art, mathematics, language, or science, requires the integration of both hemispheres.[10] Others in art education insist that the presence of an expanded art program in the school promotes a greater interest in other subjects. Even if this were to be true, an expanded science program might produce the same result. It is unwise for us to claim a value for art activities which is not unique to art, but can be achieved by other means as well. When such is the case, art can be replaced by those other disciplines.

Much the same problem arises with our misdirected attempt to

rationalize art in the school as a medium to assist in the learning of reading.[11] Even if the arguments used to support this concept were true, they fall heir to the same error of strategy. Thus, what emerges from a review of art education theory during the last 40 years or so is a desperate and constantly changing attempt to legitimize the teaching of art on instrumental grounds. We do not insist on the educational value of art because its proper role in our lives is a significant end in itself, but because we believe that through art we can promote other outside-of-art behavioral developments.[12] Each of our recent claims for the basic status of art shares this instrumental character: therapy, creativity, perceptual competence, humaneness, right brain development, growth in reading skill. It is as if we have forgotten our roots or consider them in some sense to be inferior. As a result, we drift further and further away from our ancestral preoccupation with art into areas in which we are, to put it unkindly but bluntly, inept.

If our goal were to be the reformation of the society in which we live, a purpose itself fully as instrumental as the others cited above, one might understand the motivation involved and support the emphasis. Social education to this end is one of the most critical purposes of schooling, and the visual arts can claim significant ways of contributing to growth in this context. But the claims cited earlier are, for the most part, highly individualistic, and each of them is carefully non-political. Since we do not propose to share in social reconstruction through education, we should at least argue our strongest case, namely, that aesthetic experience in response to visual stimuli of all kinds is a "basic" facet of experience and that its incidence and nature can be enhanced by the knowledge which art teachers can provide to students in school.

However, in an essay of this kind it is likely to be more useful to propose a program of action, a viable alternative model of the teaching of art in the schools, rather than to merely engage in an academic and not always fruitful quarrel over theoretical positions. Therefore, I will present a fairly unique viewpoint regarding the purpose and functions of art education—a viewpoint well out of step with the mainstream of conceptions and policies in the field today. In order to explain this alternative view of art teaching, I will make five points. Each of these points should grow logically out of the previous one. Also, the five points together will provide a justification for the claim that art should be a basic ingredient in the curriculum of the school, on grounds different than those we have looked at previously.

1. The education of children in schools should have as its basic

purpose the development of the competence to analyze how the world works and how to improve its social organization. The problems of human existence are, in part, physical; that is, problems relating to the production and distribution of goods and services necessary for human survival. Another group of problems can be identified as moral, those dealing with how we articulate social relationships. A third group is aesthetic, that is, involving the placement of intrinsic value in experience. The most significant competence required for the solution of these problems is discursive verbal ability. Ideas about all of these problems, even the aesthetic ones, are always framed in words. Visual materials in the form of diagrams, photographs, or even sculpture can help to picture or exemplify ideas but are rarely sufficient to explore them fully. For example, justice, dignity, democracy, or the process of growing wheat in Nebraska are concepts most effectively stated and communicated in words, though pictures can certainly help to "illustrate" them.

The core of the school curriculum should be discursive language, just as it is in most school situations. This is not to say, of course, that verbal competence of this kind is taught as effectively as it should be or could be. But that is another problem and another essay.

Some in art and art education believe exactly the opposite. For example, the Rockefeller Commission opened its 1977 report with a statement that includes the sentence: "This Report asserts that American education exaggerates the importance of words as transmitters of information.[13] This is an inadequate and anti-intellectual assertion and should not remain unchallenged. Also, it is ill-advised for us to attempt to enlarge the importance of our own field by belittling the value of another.

However, it is not enough to develop discursive competence among the young. My sense of the obligation of public education and of the teacher as an instrument of that process includes moral education. Schooling should be directed towards what Paulo Freire calls "conscientizacao," or learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality.[14] The quality of life about which our politicians talk so glibly and of which aesthetic experience is so rich a part, starts with social justice and a solid base of material well-being. I never apologize for being middle class; I can only wish that all people everywhere shared my status. A comfortable place to live, adequate nourishment, and medical care, are taken for granted when we have them. We should not forget their importance to those who do not have them.

One might even expand this position to suggest, as Professor Hans Giffhorn of West Germany has done, that "... all instruction—art education included—is necessarily political education as well."[15] I believe that our past and present lack of attention to social issues in art education is itself a form of political education. What we have been and are teaching is a lofty disdain for the so-called mundane matters of job, family, and political process (a tacit support for the social status quo) in favor of content-less visual relationships. In effect, therefore, we are contributing to the moral impotence of the next generation of citizens, locking art education, as Giffhorn puts it, in an "aesthetic ghetto."

In fact, art education, in the United States at least, is energetically moving in precisely the opposite direction to that of social responsibility, as the Rockefeller Commission Report quotation above indicates. When intellectual competence in verbal terms is considered overemphasized in our schools—even though the content of our present education is largely innocent of ideas critical of our social structure—it would seem that we are far from following Freire's dictum. One cannot help but conclude that this is an idea whose time has not yet arrived.

2. Aesthetic response to works of art is one special type of what is a general human attribute. As far as we can discern, all human beings possess the capability for aesthetic response which can be generated by any aspect of experience. The farmer who enjoys the freshness and warmth of a summer morning, not for what it can do for his crops, but for the sensations themselves, and the machinist who delights in the precision and workmanship of a new lathe, are engaged in aesthetic response just as much as the art teacher or student who is thrilled at a Tintoretto or Pollock. John Dewey puts it this way:

> In order to understand the esthetic in its ultimate the approved forms, one must begin with it in the raw; in the events and scenes that hold the attentive eye and ear of man, arousing his interest and affording him enjoyment as he looks and listens; the sights that hold the crowd—the fire-engine rushing by; the machines excavating enormous holes in the earth; the human-fly climbing the steeple-side; the men perched high in air on girders, throwing and catching red-hot bolts. The sources of art in human experience will be learned by him who sees how the tense grace of the ball-player infects the onlooking crowd; who notes the delight of the housewife in tending her plants, and the intent interest of her goodman in tending the patch of green in front of the house; the zest of the spectator in poking the wood burning on the hearth and in watching the darting flames and crumbling coals.[16]

This passage later includes the sentence, "The intelligent mechanic engaged in his job, interested in doing well and finding satisfaction in his handiwork, caring for his materials and tools with genuine affection, is artistically engaged.[17] If Dewey's contention is true, then aesthetic response is a basic form of human valuing and cannot be a frill or peripheral concern in education. What we owe every one of our children is the knowledge with which to understand the nature of that experience and the desire to enjoy it in its broadest variety of modes and circumstances. Does this assessment then place education in the visual arts at the core of the curriculum?

The arguments for core status for art and, particularly, the way they are phrased are unnecessarily assertive. They appear to represent an overcompensation for our inadequate curricular position in the school. We do not have to insist that the visual arts must be the very center of the curriculum. There are strong criticisms of that idea, some of which I described previously. On the other hand, it is reasonable to suggest that art ought to occupy more time and attention in both elementary and secondary education than it does now. How much more time and attention? I suspect none of us is wise enough to know. Furthermore, percentages of time, while they sound impressive, may not be the best solution to the problem. Perhaps the type of art curriculum we propose will suggest how and in what proportion art can be integrated into school time.

3. The proper content of art education is the nature and function of aesthetic experience, in its broadest sense, and all the various instances and objects which evoke that experience. These latter not only include the traditional and honorific fine arts, but should also include, the popular arts, the folk arts, and the mass media.

For the reader who is familiar with the current literature in art education, what I am suggesting may sound much like what is called "aesthetic education." However, that name is an unfortunate misnomer, since up to now aesthetic education, in most writings, has had little to do with learning about the nature of aesthetic experience. Instead, in most instances it seems to me to be a rehash of what we have been doing in art education for decades with some art history and art criticism thrown in.

In addition, the new aesthetic education, no less than the old art education, can be correctly characterized as elitist in its conception of what constitutes art. Most writings in our field today treat all but the arts accepted in museum and gallery with hostility, unconcealed disdain, or total disregard, despite the fact that there is no evidence—save preference of social class—that response to the

fine arts is in any way superior to response to, for example, mass media. The stimuli are certainly vastly different, but the responses may well be similar.

The art program I am recommending entails not only a thorough analysis, appropriate to the grade level, of ideas about aesthetic response, but an honest and unprejudiced review of all the sources for visual aesthetic experience available in our society: films, television, quilts, dolls, billboards, magazine advertisements, as well as paintings, architecture, and the rest of the fine arts. Educators have the responsibility to make all the visual arts accessible to all pupils to ensure that they can approach any visual stimulus (from a tree to a chair to "Guernica") with some potential affection and at least adequate knowledge. I am not suggesting that we have the right to indoctrinate them with our own preferences. Taste should be the individual's prerogative, as long as—from an educational viewpoint—choices are made on the basis of knowledge rather than as a result of ignorance.

Therefore the purpose of our teaching should be to enhance the aesthetic potential of our pupils, or to put it more simply, to increase their interest in and knowledge about art.

4. School art activities which would promote the purpose described above clearly fall into the non-studio category. It is difficult to understand the nature of one's aesthetic response while creating a picture with tempera paint or a pot with clay. Distracting factors will interfere, such as concern for the effectiveness of the finished product or problems involving the materials of the work or its organization. Creation is not the mirror image, in reverse, of response. Nor is it reasonable to expect to develop knowledge of and affection towards all the available types of visual arts through the cumbersome and time-consuming process of making them in the classroom. Furthermore, it is unnecessary to be a basketball player to adequately appreciate the game, a composer to enjoy music, or a printmaker to respond to lithographs. For all the rest of their lives, the large majority of our pupils will look at, talk about, and read about art. Very few will make works of art. The program I am suggesting would involve pupils in these appreciational tasks, an engagement in the real world in which they live. It should also provide facilities, trained personnel and encouragement for those pupils who wish, in addition, to make art. But making art would not be a requirement for everyone.

I realize that there is a hallowed and sacrosanct tradition for the studio curriculum in art education which remains virtually unquestioned in our literature. I also believe that the many rationales devel-

oped over the years to validate this studio curriculum can be and have been very damagingly criticized.[18] Conceptions of the benefits which grow out of studio activities in the classroom such as therapy, creativity, humaneness, and general perceptual competence have been accepted far too long without careful scrutiny. Furthermore, these developmental values tend to direct our attention away from the visual arts and their larger venue, aesthetic experience, which are, after all, the origins of our discipline. What we should be doing in the school is to return to those origins, not by covering acres of newsprint with tempera paint, but by teaching the knowledge of what paintings, buildings, and photographs have meant and can mean and why we react to them as we do.

For the reader who finds the idea of eliminating or drastically reducing the studio component of our required art curricula completely indigestible, let me call upon some allies in this enterprise. Unfortunately, they are very few in number. Almost every one of those writers who contributes to the literature of art education recommends a significant portion of studio activities in the school art curriculum, whether this is suggested in the name of creativity or, as is more popular today, visual literacy. There are, however, some changes in the literature. It will come as no surprise to the reader to find that Edmund Feldman urges us to concern ourselves primarily with the response aspects of art learning rather than its expressive aspects. He writes: ". . . The primary effort of education should be the employment of art to improve the visual and linguistic literacy of the population as a whole . . . we should give serious attention to general and aesthetic education, the training of citizens who understand and enjoy the arts."[19]

While Feldman does not renounce studio activity in the classroom, his wording indicates a disenchantment with manipulative curricula. For example, he states: ". . . School pupils will learn soon enough and despite what some educationists have written that the notion that everyone is an artist is the sheerest nonsense. That alone is a worthwhile discovery since it generates increased appreciation of the achievements of those who can perform well as artists."[20]

More directly, a recent textbook on art education describes in some detail the comments of the art supervisor of a suburban school system. Ten high school students who were "identified as being committed to the visual arts by their teachers" spent three half-day sessions observing the work in progress and talking to a visiting sculptor at a museum. They saw his work and his slides, listened to his goals in the project at hand and his general com-

ments about himself and his art. The story continues:

> The students had the aims of the project explained to them and were encouraged to enter into a dialogue with the artist about any aspect of himself, his work, or the proposed project. An embarrassing pause occurred at this point—there was total silence. After their return to the school, however, the students were most vocal, and negative, about the introductory session and asked to be excused from further participation in the project. Some of their comments were: "He's not an artist"; "What a bore"; "Does he *really* believe that's art?"; "It doesn't make any sense"; "Is he *paid* to do that junk?"; "I couldn't understand a thing he said"; "Who's he trying to impress?"[21]

The incident described above provokes the following unequivocal statement later on the same page:

> The students discussed in this anecdote had an average of eight years of formal art instruction in the public schools. They were skilled in making art through a variety of media and techniques but, contrary to assumptions which are rampant in current art curricula, the making of art doesn't necessarily insure an understanding of art, an understanding demonstrated by heightened perception, reflective thinking, the employment of critical skills, openness to new and unusual experiences, a tolerance of the unique, and the use of an arts vocabulary. The absence of such understanding was obvious in the instance just described. Unfortunately, this very situation, and others similar to it, are all too common and they provide ample evidence of a need for direct, planned, instruction which will lead students to a full understanding of the nature, role, and product of an artist.[22]

As I am sure you have noted, there is more than one conclusion one might draw from the example cited. One that the volume does not include is that, in fact, the artist in question was a bore, his work was junk, and his discussion with the students was inept. The second which is also avoided is that the practice of bringing children into contact with artists (for example, the ubiquitous and highly touted Artists-in-Schools programs, for which the United States government has already spent several millions of dollars) can be highly unsuccessful. One wonders where this instance of failure in bringing together artist and pupils, and others like it, was hidden when the Western States Arts Foundation prepared its umblemished whitewash of the A.I.S. program.[23]

The conclusion the authors do entertain—and correctly so—is that making art does not necessarily lead to skills in appreciation, a conclusion which can be reached and had been reached earlier on

theoretical grounds.[24] Thus, if one's conception of the role of art teaching includes the idea that children should learn to know about and enjoy works of art of every sort, activities other than the making of art will have to be engaged and emphasized in the art curriculum of the school.

5. A curriculum implementing the ideas explored in the first four sections above would be, in effect, a dialogue curriculum. It would require not 10% or 20% or 40% of the school day or week, but would require, instead, a natural portion of every school activity, just as aesthetic experiences prompted by visual stimuli occur naturally throughout each day of our lives. On some occasions we plan to set aside special times when we think they will happen, as when we go to see a film or visit a museum or a new building. Just so, some special times might be set aside in each school day when we deal with some aspect of the art encountered in that day. The principle of such curriculum development is that visual aesthetic valuing, the placing or finding of intrinsic merit in an object or process, can be a frequent event in everyone's life every day, rather than a special precious occurrence limited to working with artist's materials or looking at what artists make.

For example, a second grade unit on the local community might reasonably include some review of historical buildings (hopefully restored or scheduled for preservation) in that town. The classroom teacher could prepare and present information about these buildings that explains why and how they were built, what qualities make them worthy to some people of preservation, and the extent to which these buildings relate to others of a similar style or purpose. Such a dialogue, with discussion, pictorial materials in the form of slides, photographs, and films, and readings when appropriate, is art education of a high order and grows naturally out of other content in the school day (just as does the vast majority of our art experience). It identifies art not solely as some esoteric experience in creating with paint or clay, but rather a frequent if not constant event in the life of the school. A further bonus of such a curriculum is that it greatly reduces the uneasiness with which many elementary teachers view the visual arts, where they are presently expected to direct studio performance without an adequate background of their own in that performance.

To continue with our illustration, if the teacher anticipates that the study of historic buildings in the community can provide the impetus for a broader investigation of art, a special unit can be developed. The children might visit one or more of the building sites with cameras (or drawing materials, if they prefer) to visually record

their selected aspects of the structures. Or they might, in groups, take a videocamera to any building under construction—whatever its architectural merit, videotape the processes, and interview the workmen and the architect. The amount of knowledge and interest which might be generated from such a project is limited only by the time and facilities available and the combined initiative and imagination of teacher and pupils, limitations applicable to any other educational situation.

It is up to the teacher, of course, to make sure that the aesthetic considerations appropriate to the context are explored in terms consistent with the capabilities of the children. The main issue, again, is not to tell them which buildings are architecturally superior and "should" be appreciated, but rather what qualities are available for our enjoyment in all structures. Much the same kind of project might be developed out of billboards, embroidery, television programs or commercials, or magazine photography. Once we get art out of the prison of museum and gallery, it becomes, as it is in actuality, part of everyone's everyday life. This is not to say that museums, galleries, fine films, or the most extreme of current styles in painting and sculpture should be ignored. On the contrary, they often (though not always) employ the most sophisticated examples of the aesthetic qualities we wish to explore. As long as we do not treat them as the only repositories of aesthetic value and move to their frequent complexity from the simpler grammar of other art forms, we will have done what art education should do.

The concepts of value, policy, and program described here as an alternative model for art teaching are, I believe, reasonable and moderate. They also represent a massive redirection of how we think about our profession, a change in viewpoint far too drastic to be presently acceptable. In the meantime, one cannot be blamed for the suspicion that art education will stumble along, wracked by fragmentation and pretentiousness of purpose and paralysis of curriculum and will be largely unsuccessful in its attempts, on inadequate grounds, to convince anyone of its stature as an educational basic. We may have come a long way, but we have a long way to go.

REFERENCES

1. Lewis Carroll, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland,* London: Richard Clay, 1965, p. 1.
2. Jacques Barzun, "Art and Educational Inflation," *Art Education,* Vol. 31, October 1978, p. 5.

3. For earlier instances of comment upon the inflated claims in art education, the reader might refer to: Harold Taylor, *Art and the Intellect,* New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1960, p. 36, or Vincent Lanier, "Hyphenization Takes Command," *Art Education,* Vol. 14, June 1961, pp. 4,5,11,13; "Schismogenesis in Contemporary Art Education," *Studies in Art Education,* Vol. 5, Fall 1963, p. 17; "A Plague on All Your Houses: The Tragedy of Art Education," *Art Education,* Vol. 27, March 1974, 13; "The Five Faces of Art Education," *Studies in Art Education,* Vol. 18, Spring 1977, pp. 13,14.
4. Michael Steveni, *Art and Education,* London: B.T. Batsford, 1966, p. 30.
5. Louise D., Yochim, *Perceptual Growth in Creativity,* Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1967, p. 21.
6. Arts, Education and Americans Panel, D. Rockefeller, Jr, Chr., *Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977, p. 248.
7. National Art Education Association, *Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education,* Reston, Virginia: NAEA, 1977, p. 42.
8. Roger M. Williams, "Why Children Should Draw," *Saturday Review,* September 3, 1977, p. 11.
9. Mary M. Stuart, "Art as Developer in the Education of the Young Child," *Virginia Journal of Education,* Vol. 9, September 1915, as cited in Ralph Jacobs, "An Historical Study of the Justifications for the Teaching of Art and Its Inclusion as a School Subject in North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia," Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1969, p. 284.
10. Hermine Feinstein, *A College Drawing Curriculum Integrating Langer's Theory of Symbolization and Aspects of Hemispheric Processes,* Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1978, Chapters I, II, V.
11. Elliot W. Eisner, ed., *Reading, the Arts and the Creation of Meaning,* Reston, Virginia: NAEA, 1978.
12. Earlier examples of the distinction between the intrinsic and instrumental values of art in the school and its influence on our purposes in art education can be found in: Vincent Lanier, "Schismogenesis in Contemporary Art Education," *op. cit.,* p. 18, and *Teaching Secondary Art,* Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1964, pp. 74-76, 78.
13. Arts, Education and Americans, *op. cit.,* p. 3.
14. Paulo, Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* New York: Herder and Herder, 1970, p. 19.
15. Hans Giffhorn, "Ideologies of Art Education," *Studies in Art Education,* Vol. 19, Spring 1978, p. 52.
16. John Dewey, *Art as Experience,* New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1934, pp. 4-5.
17. *Ibid.*
18. For example, a critical analysis of creativity can be found in: Vincent Lanier, "Schismogenesis in Contemporary Art Education. *op. cit.,* pp.

14-16, and Elliot W. Eisner, "Examining Some Myths in Art Education," *Studies in Art Education,* Vol. 15, 1973-74, pp. 9,10. For a critical assessment of both creativity and perceptual competence, see: Vincent Lanier, "Conception and Priority in Art Education Research," *Studies in Art Education,* Vol. 16, 1974-75, pp. 26-28.

19. Edmund B. Feldman, "Learning Through the Visual Arts," *School Arts,* December 1978, p. 18.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Al Hurwitz, and Stanley A. Madeja, *The Joyous Vision,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
22. *Ibid.*
23. Western States Arts Foundation, "A Study of the Poetry and Visual Arts Components of the Artists-in-Schools Program," *Study Summary,* 1976.
24. Vincent Lanier, "Returning the Art to Art Education." *Art Education,* Vol. 28, March 1975, pp. 29-30. Also see Vincent Lanier, "The Seven (or Three) Letter Four Letter Word," *1976 Annual Journal,* Canadian Society for Education Through Art, pp. 23-25.

CHILD ART, SCHOOL ART, AND THE REAL WORLD OF ART

MICHAEL D. DAY
University of Minnesota

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Art education programs which are not based on sound educational and artistic principles have no merit in competing for a basic place in the school curriculum. Day emphasizes this point by tracing the distinction between what transpires in many art programs and the actual world of art which he believes should provide inspiration and resource. Aided by what we know about children's artistic maturation and development, art educators must create curriculum which is soundly based on philosophical, psycholgical, social, cultural, and educational principles. Day describes both the limitations of widely-held theories of child art and the possibilities for expanding our concepts in order to give art a real chance to be basic in education.

Is art education an essential component of a basic education? What is basic about art education? What is a basic art education?

The answer to the first question depends on the source of the response. Obviously art is not currently a basic in the curriculum of American schools, so the general reply from boards of education, administrators, and other educational decision makers in this country is evidently a negative one. Art is not an essential in our schools although many fine art programs do operate within a minor portion of the nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Yet there are those who insist that art education must be included as part of a balanced or complete curriculum. In relation to an education without art, they declare the term "basic" can be translated to mean "narrow," "incomplete," or even "impoverished."[1] Those who take this position are obviously in the small minority judging from the actual situation in the schools, but they are able to support their position with rational and persuasive arguments.

These arguments provide answers to the second question, "What is basic about art education?" Why should art be included in the complete curriculum? What does experience with art offer that is essential and basic to learners?" It is important to realize that this question is of interest to a much smaller group than is the first question. Many of those who don't believe that art is a basic in education will not be interested in arguments to the contrary.

Consideration of the third question, "What is a basic art education?" is different from the previous question in that it focuses on art education *per se* rather than on the position of art education within the context of general education. Discussion of this more discretely defined question will, I believe, contribute to the dialogue surrounding the two prior questions. Hopefully, clarification of fundamentals within art education might shed light on the issue of art as a curricular basic.

Art educators function at the interface of two great givens of art education: the learner and the subject of learning. At the public school level the learners are children and adolescents, and that which is learned derives from the disciplines of the visual arts. A curious phenomenon confronts art educators in the existence of something called "Child Art," which embraces child development, a pedagogical approach, and a mythology. Scholars have developed theories of child art[2] with attendant prescriptions for fostering growth in children. Examples of child art have been collected by

the millions and have been displayed, admired, and analyzed.[3] The body of literature on the study of child art is considerable.

CHILD ART

At very early ages children begin their graphic behavior by making marks with whatever tool or instrument is available. By age two nearly all children are involved in the making of scribbles, and they continue to develop a repertoire of marks and configurations of marks for several years. Scribbling is considered to be both meaningful and valuable behavior by students of children's artistic development. Through scribbling the child is able to bring about something visible that was not there before,[4] while engaging in an intrinsically satisfying rhythmic motor activity with arm and hand. Scribble marks and configurations of marks that become the building blocks for later development of graphic symbols have been catalogued and analyzed.[5]

As children continue their marking and scribbling activities, whether with crayon on paper, fingers on dusty surfaces, or sticks in the sand, they eventually arrive at a point where an association is made between their graphic product and objects or persons in their environment. Usually around age 3 or 4, children accomplish the significant act of graphic symbol formation when they point to a scribbled shape or mark and call it the name of an object or person. This event marks the beginning of each child's development of a personally meaningful graphic symbol system.

Early symbols in children's drawings, paintings, or sculptures are primitive, undifferentiated, and often unrecognizable in relation to their references without verbal clues from the child.[6] Graphic symbolic behavior, however, continues to develop, and children produce progressively more sophisticated symbols. Representation of the human figure progresses from simple circular shapes with the addition of limbs and face markings to figures that include trunk, arms and fingers, legs and feet, neck and head, face and hair, with sex characteristics and clothing. Many children develop the ability to draw figures in action and to place figures in meaningful settings with natural objects, buildings and so on, by the time they reach ages 9 or 10.[7]

The development of this symbol system is seen most clearly in children's drawings. The engagement of children in the creation of such art appears to be a virtually universal phenomenon. The visual qualities of child art include a freshness, directness, and spontaneity that are valued by many adults. Children are often not hesitant, as adults might be, to paint and draw complex scenes or

situations, and they seem able to solve difficult problems of representation with naive but effective solutions.

Children's engagement in this symbolic expressive behavior is deemed significant by writers on the topic of child art. Because the child's drawing symbols are self-developed, they are especially useful for self-expression; children can draw images relevant to their personal thoughts and feelings, and in their art can control the outcome of situations and fantasies. Through art children are able to give form to their hopes and fears and to investigate and evaluate aspects of real life that capture their interest. Lowenfeld asserts that children obtain emotional satisfaction from art activity and that it can serve to release the frustrations encountered in life. The art product of the child is of interest, but art education is primarily concerned with the effect that the process has on the individual. For Viktor Lowenfeld, art activity for children allows them to bring together diverse elements of experience to make new and meaningful wholes. In the process of selecting, interpreting, and reforming these elements, "the child gives us a part of himself: how he thinks, how he feels, and how he sees."[8]

Art for children is also perceived as a means to engage all of the senses for learning and expression. Participation in art-making heightens children's sensitivity to the physical world and fosters a more perceptive appreciation of the environment. Charles Gaitskell claims that "the informed and sensitive use of the eye is necessary for a broad understanding of the modern." [9] Art helps the child to give order to sense impressions and provides a means for the expression of imagination and feeling.[10] In his argument for education through art, Herbert Read asserts that art is "the only human activity that can establish a universal order in all we do and make, in thought and imagination."[11]

The effects of art activity on children's self concepts and general personality development are seen by some as very beneficial. Art is viewed as a means for children to develop their inherent creative abilities and, in the process, to integrate other personality dimensions, such as the emotional, social, and aesthetic. This emphasis on personality development suggests that "the goal in teaching art to children is not to train artists but to offer experiences that contribute to the growth of the personality." [12] Child art is seen as instrumental in "fostering and preserving an individual's human identity, uniqueness, esteem, and accomplishment."[13]

In addition to providing means for personal expression, perceptual growth, and personality integration, claims are made that art activity contributes to cognitive development. Nearly fifty years ago

John Dewey stated:

> To think effectively in terms of relations of qualities is as severe a demand upon thought as to think in terms of symbols, verbal and mathematical. Indeed, since words are easily manipulated in mechanical ways, the production of a work of genuine art probably demands more intelligence than does most of the so-called thinking that goes on among those who pride themselves on being "intellectuals." [14]

Cognitive claims for art activity are also made from such diverse sources as Rhoda Kellogg[15] and Martin Engel[16]; and Elliot W. Eisner has outlined no less than nine things, from symbol formation and symbolic play to the expressive function of visual forms, that children can learn through the act of painting.[17]

Not all of the justifications briefly discussed above are equally convincing, and disagreements regarding the value of children's artistic involvement exist among the authors cited. Nevertheless, the considerable body of scholarly effort already noted and typified is not to be ignored by any serious educator and most assuredly not by art educators. What we have available from this literature, for those who are willing and able to sort through it, are insights into the nature of young learners that might serve well to guide educational practice. These insights are gained primarily through observation of children making art and by analysis of their artistic production. These insights are essential to formulating a basic art education.

THE REAL WORLD OF ART

When children take a mathematics class in school, they study mathematics; they learn about history in history class, and in science class they learn some of the basic ideas from the disciplines of science. It follows, logically, that in art class children learn about art. However, art class is a place that is not always associated with learning. Some people would be hard pressed to describe the content which can be learned in art class. This content is found within what I call "the real world of art," which includes the extremely broad areas of art history, contemporary art, commercial art, and the attendant systems for evaluating and marketing the production of artists.

The visual arts from the great ages and cultures of the world can be profitably studied. Children can learn about the arts of Egypt, Greece, Africa, and China, to mention a few, and how those arts related to the societies, religions, and technologies of the respective cultures. They can gain understandings of the roles and lifestyles

of artists in various cultural settings and how artists have responded to the requirements of those who commissioned their work.

The visual language of art is also an important content area. Children can learn about line, shape, color, texture, and form both intellectually and experientially; and they can study ways that these design elements are manipulated in relation to visual rhythm, balance, repetition, emphasis, pattern, and many other principles. The limitless possibilities of visual composition can be attended to in relation to the students' own work as well as in the works of outstanding adult artists.

Much is to be learned about the various modes and media within the visual arts. Unless they have opportunities to become informed, children don't know that in addition to drawing, painting, and sculpture, the visual arts include printmaking, ceramics, filmmaking, photography, video, glassworking, and others.[18] And students can learn that within each of these modes artists utilize a multiplicity of media and techniques, e.g., sculpture with wood, stone, metal, fibers, or plastic; printmaking as serigraphy, lithography, intaglio, etching, or block printing.

Children can learn about individual artists and schools or movements in art through study of art history and through personal experiences such as visits by artists to the school, visits to artists' studios and to galleries and museums. The motivations, inspirations, intentions, and achievements of artists can be investigated in person or through educational media. Students can learn what it means to be an artist, what an artist contributes to the world, and the rewards and disappointments attending the artistic life style.

The real world of art also includes the contemporary world of art-related occupations. Young people can learn that in addition to the "fine artist," there are graphic designers, layout artists, architects, illustrators, advertising artists, animation artists, fashion designers, interior designers, and many more. They can come to realize the extent to which our lives are influenced by the arts, both fine and applied, and they can learn what opportunities might be developed within the visual arts as career choices.

Art class can also be a place to learn ways to respond to the visual arts and to develop skills of appreciation. The functions of art criticism and the influences of art critics can be experienced at levels appropriate for the ages of the learners. Current systems for art judgment and evaluation can be made known to young people, including the gallery system, the functions of the art journals and the workings of art museums, art auctions, art fairs, and societies of

artists. All of the aspects of art described briefly above are part of the real world of art and provide material that can be learned profitably by children at various ages and grade levels. The amount of content is so great that no single person could learn all of it during a lifetime of study, Therefore, judicious selection by the art educator is required.

Paradoxically, statements of justification for art education have not always centered on the values to be gained through study of the discipline. Art education has been portrayed as a means to foster creativity, provide leisure activities, develop self-concept, and improve reading scores. It might, indeed, do all of these things.[19] However, for the purpose of describing a basic art education it is probably more useful to examine some of the carefully articulated statements that speak to the functions of the arts. Harry Broudy points out that "whatever a society regards as of major importance it underscores by using art. Crucial episodes in history, critical events—birth, marriage, war, death—are stylized by ritual and ceremony so that all members of the community perceive their import through a standardized image."[20] Furthermore, society relies upon the images of art to define the social roles of the family, government, religion, and the status of individuals within these institutions. Eisner describes art as "one of man's major avenues for the formulation and expression of his ideas, his images, and his feelings. It is through the process of working with materials that these ideas, images, and feelings are not only formulated, but clarified and shared." [21]

Hans and Shulamith Kreitler view art as a major means for cognitive orientation, through which individuals can deal with such realities of existence as common reality, archeological reality, normative reality, and prophetic reality. Common reality relates to the person's beliefs about the world; archeological reality relates to belief's about one's own person; normative reality is associated with beliefs about rules and norms; and prophetic reality relates to the person's goals and wishes. For example, the Kreitlers believe that one of the major functions of art is "to provide us with concrete and vivid images of the future which may bridge the gap between the now and the later."[22] The arts provide us with the means to experience and experiment with different realities in ways that are helpful as well as harmless. They suggest that confrontation with new aspects of different layers of reality not only satisfies orientative tendencies but also widens the scope of cognitive possibilities and serves as a source for the unique kind of knowledge which is not merely known but also experienced.

Regardless of the vantage from which one views the visual arts, they are undeniably there; they reflect human history, and they influence human existence. Like child art, the real world of art cannot be ignored, especially by those engaged in art education.[23] The subject of learning in a basic art education derives primarily from the real world of art.

SCHOOL ART

It is the responsibility of art education to foster the transition from enthusiastic and involved child artists entering kindergarten to enthusiastic and involved adults who value art and for whom art is a meaningful and vital part of life. This transition requires the reconciliation of child art and the real world of art in the school.

One of the problems that art educators have struggled with for the past fifty years is that, when viewed a certain way, child art and adult art are incompatible. Child art becomes sacrosanct, and adult influence is prohibited. Within this view child art is an entity, complete in itself, with virtually no association with the real world of art.

> If it were possible for children to develop without any interference from the outside world, no special stimulation for their creative work would be necessary. Every child would use his deeply rooted creative impulses without inhibition, confident in his own means of expression. Whenever we hear children say, 'I can't draw', we can be sure that some kind of interference has occurred in their lives.[24]

He asserts repeatedly that instruction derived from adult art is not appropriate, but potentially harmful to the developing child and that not until ages 14 or 15 may purposeful learning in art begin. Betty Lark-Horovitz agrees with this view and describes learning as an increase in the child's "capacity to bring forth what is within him".[25] Henry Schaeffer-Simmern writes of "children's drawings not yet distorted by external methods," and refers to the "unadulterated creative process" in children's art production. The goal of art education for him is "the natural cultivation of growing mental powers . . . within the process of artistic configuration."[26] Kellogg advises that "adults who are concerned about education must be wary of verbalizing to any child about art and, above all, must not try to coach him into the next stage toward which he is moving."[27]

Within this conception of children's artistic development, children enter the aegis of the school as developing artists who do not require instruction, but rather encouragement and support. They develop their own symbol system but are sheltered from the visual

systems of art provided by the culture within which they reside. The child artist matures naturally and flourishes, reaching a peak of creativity and expressiveness around ages ten or eleven or even earlier, after which time most children gradually forsake their role as producers and halt their artistic development. At no time during this cycle does the child approximate the forms of adult art; child art and adult art, with the exception of a few adult artists who pursue the qualities of spontaneity and innocence that characterize child art, remain easily recognizable as separate categories. Arthur Efland has described this approach succinctly:

> Art becomes merely an instrument for the child's development rather than a component of his cultural heritage. Teaching recedes into the background. No longer the intentional behavior of a professional, teaching becomes 'gardening' and the curriculum so much fertilizer. Society is a potential source of pollution waiting to impair the unfolding of the plant.[28]

School art in this view is exclusively child art and is not related to the real world of art until, perhaps, age 14. One of the problems with this insular approach is that most children have reached the peak of their artistic career and have experienced a definite if not complete decline by age 14. Child art has a built in "dead end" as children approach adulthood. The inevitable result of maturity for the individual is either the cessation of art production or art production on an adult basis within the real world of art. Although this decline has been blamed on oppressive conditions in the schools and inappropriate intervention by adults into the natural process of children's artistic development, the answer is more reasonably described by developmental psychology.

Howard Gardner points out that the child's critical skills develop later than his capacities to act as an artist, art historian, or audience member.[29] With the development of critical skills at about age 11, the child becomes critically aware of the qualities of his own art products. If his own drawings and paintings appear more closely related to childhood than to the approaching adolescent years, the child becomes self-conscious and dissatisfied with his art work and tends to produce less or quit altogether. Eisner describes the nine or ten year old child's "dissatisfaction with his own best efforts" to produce art and marks this as the beginning of a "representational stage" when the child desires to develop technical competencies and expand his repertoire of representational skills.[30]

Stephanie Dudek also describes qualitative changes in children's mental development around age nine and attributes

changes in art production to this maturation. "The child becomes interested in testing his greater cognitive ability by attempting to use a more realistic and disciplined approach."[31] She also agrees with Frank Barron that the spontaneity and lack of convention in child art is not necessarily evidence of creativity. Barron states that "a certain amount of maturation of the talent, and discipline in its exercise, must precede its full expression. Since this also *takes time*, the complex creative act can be expected to occur only rarely in childhood, or before maturation has taken place."[32]

The solution to the problem of decline in art production prior to the teen years seems relatively clear. Gardner asserts that the ages 8 to 11 are critical in the artistic development of children. "He must make enough progress during this period so that, when he becomes capable of self-criticism, he will not find his own work too wanting."[33] If the child is to continue artistic production during adulthood, the 8-11 year old child must "work with exceeding diligence, mastering technical skills and studying the examples of the past, so that he will have achieved genuine competence by the age of 11 or 12.[34] This suggestion by Gardner and others that children steadily acquire the technical and expressive conventions of adult art provides a bridge between child art and the real world of art. Brent and Marjorie Wilson have pointed out that children do learn from the multitude of graphic images that are part of our environment and that isolation from adult influences is virtually impossible. They suggest that, since children already undergo constant influence, art educators might upgrade the level of influence by providing examples of the best imagery that our culture has to offer.[35] This imagery is found in the real world of art.

Child art is a necessary aspect of a basic art education, but it is not sufficient when we consider children beyond the age of 8. It is the role of school art, therefore, to foster in the lives of students the necessary transition from child art to the real world of art.

A second problem has emerged in that many of the art activities engaged in by children in the schools reflect neither the expressive concerns associated with child art nor valid content derived from the real world of art. Many so-called art projects are organized around holiday themes, and others involve merely the manipulation of art materials with no expressive intent. Within this type of classroom activity are a myriad of stereotypical projects in which children are asked to follow directions to form objects that are essentially similar within the entire class. Some are "one-shot" experiences that will not be repeated and which lead nowhere either intellectually or artistically. Some involve the use of novel materials and processes that have extremely tenuous relationships to the work of serious adult artists. Many of these projects result in objects that are considered to be charming or cute by those who direct them and which assure that each child will achieve the desired result and will thereby know "success."

Projects of this sort are called art activities within the schools, but in fact they usually have nothing to do with art except that the materials used are sometimes also used by child or adult artists. So called "art" projects which cannot claim validity either from the di-

rection of child art or from the direction of the real world of art are misnamed. In reality these non-art activities disguised as art do an incredible amount of harm when the issue in education is centered on the basics. The non-art projects are justifiably questioned by those who are concerned with real learning in the schools. This non-art is mistaken for art, is correctly judged to be of little value, and is ejected from the curriculum in the name of art. The chances of initiating a valid, basic program of art education in a school or district that has eliminated art on these grounds are diminished.

What is a basic art education? It is an art education that accounts for the nature of the learner as revealed through studies of child art, and that teaches valid content from the real world of art. A basic art education will assist children to develop their spontaneous expressiveness with increasing competency and through a growing range of artistic media. It will help children to gradually but consistently learn of the beauties, thrills, and treasures to be found in the real world of art of the past and of the present.

In a basic art education a child enters kindergarten at age 5 with a natural propensity to create graphic images. He is an enthusiastic producer of meaningful and expressive pictures that are relevant to his interest and representative of his experiences. As the child progresses through grades 1-3 these natural tendencies are encouraged, and he becomes more proficient in the creation of graphic symbols through his drawings and paintings. He becomes increasingly familiar with the technical possibilities of pencil, pen, and brush, and his repertoire of symbols gains in range and sophistication.

As the child progresses through grades 4 and 5, he becomes more aware of the fact that some adults devote their lives to the making of drawings, paintings, sculptures, and other art objects. His conception of art widens as he learns more about the roles that the visual arts have played in other cultures and other times. The works of art of his peers and of adults become fascinating to the child as he realizes the limitless possibilities for expression afforded by the arts. He enjoys seeing art of high quality in museums and galleries, and he is excited by visits to artists' studios.

His own artistic development continues in grades 6 and 7 with accelerated attention to the acquisition of skills in such areas as drawing, painting, and modeling. He realizes consciously what he seemed to know intuitively at an earlier age, that art is a means for personal expression of ideas and feelings, and he becomes more knowledgeable of the adult art world and more able to respond

deeply to art works of considerable merit. Whether he is a producer or appreciator, art adds meaning and joy to his life.

Political, social, economic, and educational factors are significant in the decisions regarding the basics in general education. These factors are likely to continue to exert more influence than sound philosophical and psychological arguments for art as basic in the school curriculum. Yet even sound arguments for art will not assist unless art educators are able to conceptualize, describe, and implement programs of art education that are internally valid. Only basically sound art education has a chance to become basic in general education.

REFERENCES

1. Elliot W. Eisner, "The Impoverished Curriculum," *Educational Leadership,* May 1978.
2. Dale Harris, *Children's Drawings as Measures of Intellectual Maturity,* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1963.
3. Rhoda Kellogg, *Analyzing Children's Art,* Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1969.
4. Rudolf Arnheim, *Art and Visual Perception,* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
5. Rhoda Kellogg, *op cit.*
6. Claire Golomb, *Young Children's Sculpture and Drawing,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.
7. Viktor Lowenfeld, *Creative and Mental Growth,* New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1947. This text has been updated in later editions by W. Lambert Brittain.
8. *Ibid,* p. 3.
9. Charles Gaitskell and Al Hurwitz, *Children and Their Art,* 3rd, ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975.
10. Betty Lark-Horovitz, Hilda Lewis, and Mark Luca, *Understanding Children's Art for Better Teaching,* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1967.
11. Herbert Read, "Art as a Unifying Principle in Education", in *Child Art: The Beginnings of Self-Affirmation,* Hilda Lewis, ed., Berkeley: Diablo Press, 1966, p. 17.
12. Lark-Horovitz, et. al., *op cit,* p. 4.
13. Barbara Herberholz, *Early Childhood Art,* Dubuque: William C. Brown Co., 1974.
14. John Dewey, *Art as Experience,* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1938, p. 46.
15. Kellogg, *op. cit.*
16. Martin Engel, "An Informal Framework for Cognitive Research in Arts Education", in *The Arts, Cognition, and Basic Skills,* Stanley Madeja,

104

ed., St. Louis: CEMREL, 1978.

17. Elliot W. Eisner, "What Do Children Learn When They Paint?", *Art Education*, March 1978.
18. Howard Gardner, Ellen Winner, and Mary Kircher, "Children's Conceptions of the Arts," *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, July 1975.
19. Michael Day, "Rationales for Art Education: Thinking Through and Telling Why", *Art Education*, February 1972.
20. Harry Broudy, "The Arts as Basic Education", *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, October 1978, p. 28.
21. Elliot W. Eisner, "What We Know about Children's Art—and What We Need to Know," in *The Arts, Human Development, and Education*, Elliot W. Eisner, ed., Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1976, p. 8.
22. Hans Kreitler and Schulamith Kreitler, *Psychology of the Arts*, Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1972, p. 351.
23. Edmund B. Feldman, *Becoming Human Through Art*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
24. Lowenfeld, *op cit.* p. 8.
25. Lark-Horovitz, et. al., *op. cit.*, p. 4.
26. Henry Schaeffer-Simmern, *The Unfolding of Artistic Activity*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948, p. 27.
27. Kellogg, *op. cit.*, p. 143.
28. Arthur Efland, "Changing Views of Children's Artistic Development: Their Impact on Curriculum and Instruction," in *The Arts, Human Development, and Education*, Eisner, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 82.
29. Howard Gardner, *The Arts and Human Development*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
30. Elliot W. Eisner, "What We Know about Children's Art—and What We Need to Know," *op. cit.*, p. 5.
31. Stephanie Dudek, "Teachers Stifle Children's Creativity: A Charge Too Easily Made", *Learning*, August 1976, p. 102.
32. Frank Barron, "Creativity in Children", in *Child Art: The Beginnings of Self-Affirmation*, Lewis, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 65.
33. Howard Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 257.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
35. Brent Wilson and Marjorie Wilson, "An Iconoclastic View of the Imagery Sources in the Drawings of Young People," *Art Education*, January, 1977.

ARTS EDUCATION: CATALYST FOR STUDENT MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE*

KATHRYN BLOOM
The JDR 3rd Fund

EDITOR'S NOTE:
The salutary impact of comprehensive arts education on broader educational interests is here reported by the major private foundation sponsor of innovative arts education projects. Kathryn Bloom indicates that only limited claims can be made for a cause-and-effect relationship between arts education and student achievement and the acquisition of basic skills. But it is also evident that some significant learning, often manifest by process skills of motivation and attitude, results from students' exposure to the arts. Furthermore, it appears that no adverse impact can be attributed to a more central role for the arts in schooling.

---

*This chapter is a version of a paper first prepared in January 1976 for general use in describing some aspects of the Arts in Education Program of The JDR 3rd Fund.

Almost all school systems have one distinguishing characteristic in common: the educational priority that all children should achieve certain levels of proficiency in basic skills, usually defined as reading, writing, and mathematics. No special project which has major influence throughout a school district is acceptable to school board members, parents, and school administrators if achievement levels in the basic skills decline. The strongest endorsement and continuing support of any program designed to affect every child will result if achievement levels in basic skills rise. Among the first questions asked about arts in education projects by school administrators and board members are: "How does an arts in education program relate to the broader educational priorities in a school district?" "Does such a program have adverse effects on student achievement in the basic skills?"

When comprehensive arts in education programs were first initiated, the belief was widespread that the arts *are* important in the general education of every child, both as subjects of study for their own sake, and as basic tools for improving the quality of education. The "quality of education" was perceived as embracing a broader range of learning opportunities than just basic skills. Therefore the projects were not viewed narrowly as remedial programs which would raise every child's performance level in basic skills.

Since school boards and administrators of school districts that established arts in education programs considered the arts important for their intrinsic value, and since these projects have continued to develop and flourish over a period of years, it seems reasonable to assume that student achievement levels had been maintained in basic skills, and that the arts possibly were supportive of learning in other subjects of study. As an alternative, it might be the case that levels of accomplishment had not increased or, possibly, achievement levels were lower, but that arts in education programs were not considered responsible for this negative situation. To clarify these questions, an inquiry was sent in January 1975 to persons responsible for arts in education projects with which the JDR 3rd Fund has worked over a considerable period of time.

Certain interesting generalizations can be made from the information provided by the respondents. Most importantly, achievement levels in basic skills were maintained or improved. However, it also was pointed out by several respondents that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to attribute gains directly to the arts in edu-

cation. This is due to the fact that a great many factors affect student learning, and the introduction of a new program, regardless of how pervasive it may be in the total educational program, it is difficult to equate with learning in other subjects of study. The real question, however, is not whether the arts raise the top scores of student proficiency in basic skills. It is whether the lowest scores fall even further. If they do not, or if they improve, it may not be possible to give credit directly to an arts in education program, but at the same time it is obvious that an arts in education program is not having an adverse effect on other areas of learning.

During a time when proficiency in the basic skills is a priority for most school systems, the belief frequently is encountered that any school activity that takes time away from the study of reading, writing, and mathematics will interfere with the ability of children to reach acceptable achievement levels. Yet it is well known that the accomplishments of programs designed to improve achievement in basic skills, especially in large urban centers, sometimes fall short of expectations. For example, when children cannot learn to read, solutions to the problem too often are sought by providing more instruction in reading. Not surprisingly, children still do not improve significantly in reading. Consequently, more attention is now being given to ways in which children are motivated to learn and how their attitudes toward school can be improved. In classrooms where students are involved in painting or improvisation, or where connections are being made between the arts and other subjects (including basic skills), there is a sense of excitement, of positive action, and of absorption in the task at hand. Such behavior illustrates the fact that the arts can be powerful motivating forces and can change youngsters' attitudes toward learning in general.

The inquiry sent to persons responsible for arts in education projects read in part as follows:

> As we work with school districts and state education departments, several questions continue to arise and one which is of chief concern is whether comprehensive arts in general education programs in school districts have negative effects on student achievement in basic skills or, hopefully, whether such programs can help to improve test scores. We all have some answers, but it would be extremely helpful to have specific information on this and several related questions from persons who are directly responsible for arts in education programs. Can you offer any data on such questions as:
>
> During the time your project has been under way, have there been changes in the level of student performance in basis skills?
>
> Is there any observable change in student motivation and atti-

tudes toward learning generally as a result of arts in general education programs?

Information on the following projects was provided in response to the request for information:

Arts in General Education Program of the University City, Missouri, Public Schools, by Dr. Glenys G. Unruh, Assistant Superintendent.

This first comprehensive arts in education pilot project supported by the JDR 3rd Fund was initiated in summer 1968. University City, a suburb of St. Louis, is a small school district with a highly successful curriculum integrating all the arts into the general education program for every student in the school system. A major emphasis of the project has been upon interdisciplinary relationships between the various fields of the arts and other subjects of study. In addition, extensive use is made of the services of artists, performers, and museums and performing arts organizations. Perhaps the best evidence of the school district's continuing support of the Arts in General Education Program is the continuing increase of staffing in the arts. During the current year there are forty-one specialists compared to twenty-three arts specialists when the project began (in 1974-75 the student enrollment was slightly over 7,000).

For purposes of system wide assessment of student progress, the California Test of Basic Skills is administered once each year in grades three through ten. Basic skills tested with the CTBS include reading, language arts, mathematics, and study skills. Eighteen separate categories are included. According to the standardized reading scores over the past two years, there has been a decided increase in numbers of students in grades three, four, and five attaining the superior and highly superior categories of the California Test of Basic Skills as shown by reading scores in September 1974 compared with September 1973.

Attributing the upturn in achievement scores to the impact of the Arts in General Education Program is difficult to prove, but obviously it did not have a negative effect, and probably had a positive effect.

Mineola Arts in Education Program, Mineola, New York, by Dr. Prabha Sahasrabudhe, Project Director

A comprehensive arts in education pilot project begun in the summer of 1969, the emphasis at Mineola has been placed on three major approaches: first, the development of a continuous,

sequential series of arts events and activities for kindergarten through high school students provided by artists and performers and arts organizations such as museums, arts centers, and performing arts groups; second, the development of a sequential arts curriculum which is related to general education for all grade levels; and third, staff development and training, particularly for teachers. The project has attained a high level of success, receives strong support from the school administration and board of education, and is an ongoing part of the School District's operating budget.

Developing skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening has the priority in Mineola's ordering of educational goals. But along with these basic tool skills, the next four goals also emphasize *basic process skills* such as: developing curiosity and eagerness to learn; developing positive attitudes about learning and school; developing self-awareness, feeling of self-worth, security and self-assurance; and developing ability to secure and use information, pursue self interests, develop a sense of values.

Happily, there was a significant change in student performance in the process-skills area, and in their motivation and attitude toward learning generally. In the classroom, discussions of arts events such as musical comedy, drama, and mime heightened the enthusiasm of the students to become very vocal and to want to engage in oral work. It appears that these art events spur the students with a desire to attempt performances, either alone or in groups. Rewarding performances have been accomplished with poetry. While one or more students read a poem aloud, others participate by miming the poetry. In language arts, students frequently write critiques of arts events, which stimulate discussions of values. The arts events have also been integrated with Careers Awareness with discussions of the different jobs necessary to present a performance such as stagehands, electricians, the director, etc.

One first grade teacher reported:

> I have found the arts in education very gratifying, especially in my endeavors to stimulate awareness, motivate imagination and creativeness. Mainly through curriculum units concerning Art, Mime and Plays, spontaneity increased as well as opening the way for more reticent children to participate. Teacher training has stimulated my thinking and broadened the scope of possibilities. The easy availability of possible activities, projects, and ideas is important to my teaching.

The school librarian echoed and elaborated these sentiments:

> In terms of basic skills, I have seen a change in speaking and listening skills. There has been a greater interest in reading books which have been dramatized in the puppet shows. Certain students have expressed interest in continuing the puppet theater work. They set aside time to practice their show, each time refining their performance. The teachers of the pupils involved have commented that the students have shown a greater willingness to speak in the classroom. Their class work in some cases has improved greatly because they are anxious to get to practice.

Finally, the art teacher commented upon the efficiency of art activities in stimulating curricular interaction.

> A special education class (mentally retarded) made animated films illustrating the structural analysis of words found in their reading: one child illustrated small, smaller, smallest. Through these activities, the children learned the meanings of word endings. Needless to say this special class was very excited about this activity and were delighted when they saw their art work moving on film.

The music teacher observed the development of positive attitudes:

> I have noticed a steady improvement in attitudes of both staff and pupils toward the arts. They seem to be generally more tolerant toward someone involved in the arts, more eager to attend a performance, and more respectful of someone performing. They seem to listen with a more critical ear and can compare each new performance with something they have seen before."

The Arts in Education Program in Public School 3, New York City, by Mr. John Meiser, Principal.

This kindergarten through sixth grade school was established in 1971 with a very high level of community and parental involvement in the planning and organization of the school. It is essentially an alternative school based on the concept of the English Open School. The JDR 3rd Fund assisted in developing the school's educational program in order that the arts might be central to the curriculum.

Here a distinction was made between the rather narrow definition of basic skills in terms of standardized test scores in reading and mathematics (which is the usual point of reference when children's proficiency is being discussed) and a rather broader definition which would include articulateness, ease, and fluency in spoken as well as written language. It would also include the capacity to articulate and comprehend ideas in a rather broader sweep than that usually included in testing by a brief snippet of an

extract and "comprehension" questions based upon it. Similarly, "basic skills" includes in mathematics the capacity to approximate and to think geometrically, quantitatively, or graphically in ordinary daily life.

Both on the narrow and broader interpretation of the term "basic skills" there have been overall steady increments in the level of student performance. In the case of some individual children, an approach through the arts has made dramatic improvements in their general level of functioning. It is clear that for some children an approach through the arts unlocks barriers which have almost inhibited their capacity to profit from the school experience. It is also clear that for a large number of children (and perhaps for almost all) expressive work in the arts can add so much zest to their experience and so much confidence, independence, and capacity to persevere in an endeavor that their overall school experience is greatly enhanced. In the most developed classrooms in the school the arts approach has been carried throughout the curriculum so that aesthetic awareness and the urge for personal expression pervades everything that the children do. In these classrooms the standards of work in all areas have been significantly higher than in other classrooms where a more traditional approach was used.

The principal comments:

> The steadiness of the insights which children have into themselves and others and the vividness of their aesthetic awareness when they are in classrooms capable of encouraging and supporting these qualities show a kind of cognitive, aesthetic, and emotional growth which far surpasses what is normally expected of them. This maturity also shows dramatically in their capacity to practice the so-called "skills," to set themselves learning tasks which are necessary to carry out their purposes, and to refine and develop the capacities which they need to express their insights. It has been my experience throughout the life of the school that the level of work in the basic subjects as well as the degree of harmony, order, and organization in the atmosphere of the classrooms have been directly correlated with the quality of the expressive output of the children and the value placed upon it.

He continues:

> My experience in English schools, discussions with people responsible for developments there and the results of what objective investigations have been carried out, all seem to point in a similar direction. One can expect from an arts-based curriculum a small but fairly certain increment in the rate of development of basic skills together with the development of a degree of

confidence, self-reliance, resourcefulness, and willingness to work through difficulties which helps the child to become a much more self-motivated and efficient learner. A fact which has to be taken into account here, of course, is that a relatively less time is spent on drills in the "basic skills" so that the same or a slightly higher level of achievement reflects much more efficient learning and much less frustration on the part of both child and teacher.

Furthermore, in the classrooms where the expressive arts are central to the curriculum, children are markedly more curious and alert, more thoughtful in their general approach, more resourceful in finding solutions to problems, and more active in developing the skills they need for their expressive purposes. As well as this, they are markedly more respectful of other children, more considerate toward them, and more genuinely interested in hearing what they have to say.

Aesthetic Education Program, the Ridgewood Public Schools, Ridgewood, New Jersey, by Dr. Samuel B. Stewart, Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Services.

The Ridgewood Public School System receives a very high level of support from its community, and expectations regarding the quality of education available to students are equally high. An unusually large proportion of graduating seniors go on to college. The arts in education program began because the supervisors of music, art, and physical education (including dance) recognized that these programs, if they were to survive in the school system had to be more responsive to the needs of all students. The staff of the Fund's Arts in Education Program provided extensive consultant assistance to the District's administrators and arts and humanities faculty in developing a plan that was appropriate to the school system. Comparatively modest grants were made for developmental, rather than operating, expenses. Two seminars enabled school administrators to involve large numbers of faculty members in the planning and implementation of the program. Another project assisted with the revision of the social studies curriculum in one school which resulted in an interdisciplinary emphasis, including the arts. From the beginning, however, the program was seen as a means for improving the quality of education and was carried on through the school system's initiative and support without outside funding.

One result of the project seems to be an observable difference in motivation and attitude of those teachers who attended the Aesthetic Education Conference. They tend to include an aesthetic dimension in most subject matter. They also seem more concerned about human education. They are open in presenting their prob-

lems, and they frequently describe their anxieties, "Am I neglecting basic skills?" "Am I sacrificing content for art?"

Principals and supervisors note that students of aesthetic minded teachers seem more willing to take chances in writing, music, movement, and visual art. They seem more adventuresome in choosing words, more colorful and exciting in their structure of tasks. They also seem to be more self-reliant and secure. One rarely hears the familiar, "Is this right?" "Is this what you want me to do?"

From the foregoing reports it is clear that arts in education programs in these school systems are considered valuable components in the total pattern of teaching and learning, and that student and teacher experiences are richer when the arts are integral to the life of individual schools. As noted before, it is not possible to attribute gains in general learning directly to the arts on a one-to-one, cause and effect basis. However, it is evident that the reports of school district administrators, principals, and teachers converge with similar observations regarding the positive contributions of arts in education programs, and that achievement levels in basic skills hold firm or improve. This appears to indicate that arts in general education programs are of benefit to individual students and help to serve the broader educational priorities of schools systems.

A RETURN TO FUNDAMENTALS

IRVING KAUFMAN
The City College, City University of New York

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Art education has been influenced and shaped by a plethora of fashionable and convenient rationales in its search for solid grounding in the curriculum of schools. Irving Kaufman states that this eclecticism perpetuates the instrumental quality of the art program and leaves art education as a handmaiden to other interests in schools. Rather, art education ought to establish clearly and unambiguously its essential character independent of other purposes, and become a self-sufficient discipline. Aesthetic modes of knowing and the basic rudiments of the art discipline would constitute an appropriately "basic" and significant contribution to students' education.

The current demand in education for a return to the basics strikes a sympathetic note after several decades of pedagogical nostrums compounded of popular psychology, soaring slogans and, in many instances, uninhibited aimlessness. It also recalls on a more sour note, Mencken's admonition that, "the mission of the pedagogue (is) not to make his pupils think, but to make them think right." "Thinking right" is again, as on other diverse occasions, premised on a curriculum of basics, a classroom concentration on academic competencies which pupils are expected to acquire after extended exposure to the Three R's. Despite our current dislike and Mencken's classic lampooning of classroom conformity and teaching coercion, we may be forced to accept a rigorous, narrow disciplining as the "right" way to teach the mechanics and rote skills of the traditional basics.

An honest examination of this approach is needed without damaging or discarding more open educational values. We need not also believe that minimal competencies—achieving a standard mastery of the Three R's, is all that schools should be organized to accomplish. The back to the basics movement of the seventies has led to a lessening or even an elimination of school arts experiences, what Elliot W. Eisner refers to as "an unbalanced curriculum that will, in the long run, weaken rather than strengthen the quality of children's education." A perception of serious jeopardy for arts education is warranted, even as sophisticated and responsible an organization as the Council for Basic Education surprisingly supports arts instruction in the schools.

A rather basic questioning of what constitutes the basics emerges as a substantial educational issue for the immediate future. It may be a redundant declaration and one arising out of an obviously elementary educational awareness, but the contention must be made, even at the risk of an irritating repetitiveness, that as an educational concept, basics cannot be confined to the traditional Three R's. It is reasonable to suggest that even in the halcyon heyday of the little red school house and McGuffy's *Readers*, the schools were not bare bastions of Reading, Writing and 'Rithmetic.' However, it is not necessary to accept the modern revisionist claim at the opposite theoretical pole that schools should be conceived as social laboratories fomenting social change to justify a curriculum which contains more than a narrowly defined hard core of basics. As Fred Hechinger of the *New York Times* writes, " 'frills' in school are often basic." Teachers and parents interested in the overall quality of education may desire balanced budgets but

not at the expense of the educational quality also desired. They insist upon basic literacy but the more adventurous ones may even declare for beauty as a civil right!

It is not only the educator's obligation to betoken the value connotations of curriculum. Any parent or interested layman is easily aware of the subliminal affects which complement academic content, the susceptible sensibilities evoked by classroom activities influencing attitudes and behavior beyond that of acquiring basic skills. As readily apparent are the care and cultivation essential to the fostering of personally agreeable, culturally discriminative, and socially significant values. Educators do have a professional responsibility all the same to challenge publicly an arbitrary, abrupt limiting of learning experiences vital to an intelligent and sensitive development of values. Art educators particularly are mindful of what has been a continuing need to argue for their discipline as providing basic learning opportunities for expressing, forming, and critically appraising through visual imagery the feelings, suppositions, and varied experiences all humans have to come to terms with. In doing this an examination of values is not only implied, but an active search for values of consequence is encouraged in an eloquent yet pithy way.

It is not necessary to recite a litany of lament to support the need for art in education, but it may be well to point out the short-sightedness of a "pound foolish" policy. The economics in casting off the arts in school may create much greater social deficits of mutilated sensibilities and deformed cultural concepts. The arts are no irresistible panacea, but they do counter the depersonalized associations, mass insipidness of popular communications, the sterile habits of cultural narcissism and gross aggrandizement, the painful progression toward a society composed in the main of voyeuristic ninnies and conditioned technocrats. Though art does not always give us grace and joy, it does make conceivable a world that is a place of varied possibilities, of noble vistas, vivid encounters and quiet satisfactions for the eye, the mind, and the spirit. It would be blinkering the vision of students to take a mean-spirited, cost accounting, and educationally puritannical approach to schooling. It would deny them, in an important part of their lives, natural occasions in which to explore the pain and wonder of living in a manner which could make it more comprehensible and manageable. A curtailing or exclusion of art as a common experience available to those who reach for it would intensify the drift of popular perception toward what Willem de Kooning describes as the "slipping glimpses" of the world outside. It is now the kind of seeing we do

1171

when speeding by landscape in a car, a prototypical contemporary point of view, shallow and disintegrated yet strangely compressed into standardized imagery, an indiscriminate merging of unique visions and diversified contexts into a reductive illusion lacking the saving power of the imagination. The power of imagination is an inherently artistic one which can help mitigate the pressures and demands of modern living, offering those experiential oases where we can satisfy our thirsts for more than transient entertainment and refresh a spiritual quality all too impoverished in the routine of mundane concerns. Not that art education can affect all this existential splendor. But it may provide the basic learning opportunities for any individual to search out a richer way of living than might be otherwise.

In a more precise academic sense, it has been argued that the aesthetic experience and specifically that of art itself is essential to cognitive development. It is basic to the progressive acquisition of knowledge and the logical understanding of oneself and the things and events of an encompassing world. Through artistic activity, it is maintained, personal experiences become organized perceptions and visible patterns which establish meaningful communication. That is, the symbolic aspects of artistic or aesthetic experience are previous to and necessary to rational thought and logical behavior. They are not only the symbolic laminations and mergings of emotion. In this sense, the imaginative and metaphoric powers that create art, transformed from experience as vision and image—as a symbolic form—are also sources necessary to establishing meaning that become the cognitive abstractions we know as idea and judgment as well as the motivating reasons for actions. So, the value of art education in this argument lies not only in its complementing of the habitual rationality of the school environment, but as a precondition to all thinking.

Jacques Barzun was quite correct when he attacked the inflated claims made in the name of art education. I have no wish to distend the purposes or extend the educational prerequisites of art education, to "inflate the plausible and possible with the miraculous." I have argued against this tendency in the past and believe much of the confusion, uncertainty, and lack of support for art education can be attributed to the spinning of verbal and philosophical fantasies. And such fantasies of a Triumphant Art Education, unlike their more comely counterparts in the actual making or appreciation of art, have been pompous puffs and stillborn freaks or hollow illusions when not paradisiacal though ephemeral and very transient tracts, almost puerile self-absorptions with the thin air of theory

despite the professional gloss they sometimes carried.

Yet Barzun's happily laconic, admirably concise justification of art in education is probably an inadequate statement in the current climate—a climate he describes quite well. The statement "Art is an important part of our culture; it corresponds to a deep instinct in man, hence it is enjoyable and we therefore teach its rudiments" should suffice, but its flaws are not only that of abbreviation. It is not too far off the mark to suggest that most of the educational decision makers would dismiss Barzun's statement, and perhaps some art educators also may not fully comprehend the thrust of Barzun's idea. To teach something largely because it is enjoyable? Who has money for that! It is suspiciously like the research requests to study how best to view television. Somewhat redundant and guilty of a financial if not an intellectual impertinence. Like the viewer who can see to his own T.V. looking, so the public institutions of fine art and popular culture can be expected to provide for the enjoyments of art. There could also be a philosophical judging of enjoyment in what may well continue as "fun and frolic" in art education, an endlessly popular array of classroom tricks and trivialities which has dogged art education as a sentimentalist practice for too long a time. In another sense, art is not made sufficiently distinctive in Barzun's statement. Love and violence or prurience and mayhem also correspond to deep instincts in man. Whether as inner emotion or open act, these human elements are enjoyable to almost everyone at one time or another. It is as possible to analyze their nature as that of art and teach their rudiments. What distinguishes love or violence from art in Barzun's brief justification? No, there needs to be a more distinctive and intrinsically legitimate or relevant (to use a left-over sixties word) discussion of art and its role in education.

In his prescription for practice, however, Barzun is eminently correct. I could not agree more with his emphasis on artistic rudiments—on what Barzun labels as the "teachables." It is these "teachables" which merit the close attention of art educators; they have every possibility, once they are even loosely defined, of becoming as basic a part of the school curriculum as grammar, computation, or story telling. If the discipline can arrive at establishing and accepting artistic rudiments, or foundations which act as "common ground" for mental and physical activity associated with art, then a "coin of the realm" support, a concrete justification for art in education, can be put forth without the vague apprehensions and direct fears which attend the request for program support now.

In any case, art educators are called on once again, and this time with stern philosophical and fiscal threats to defend their role in the

schools. It becomes an embarrassment given the voluminous writings in the field over the past several decades. Teachers and researchers have explored the role of art education from every vantage point of politics and fashion, if not too often from a concern about the means and forms of aesthetic expression as a critical and artistic activity rather than a psychological, sociological, or civic enterprise.

Ideas and attitudes influencing and shaping art education have proliferated profusely since mid-century. They have been tiresomely though amply articulated in the professional literature if not always (thankfully) in the rank and file classroom. The list is a long one, like a screen of ranging radar beeps signalling the cloudy ideas flowing about the sprawling educational landscape: creativity in all its multifarious guises; affective, qualitative, and aesthetic education; education for the gifted, the disadvantaged, the ethnically and racially distinct, therapy for multitudes of "exceptional" children; the related arts, the interdisciplinary and integrative programs, and the correspondence between artistic and scientific problem solving; perceptual and sensory development, cultural conditioning, consumerism, and other more popular panaceas of self-actualization were all folded into an ever burgeoning rationale for art education. The rationale which has grown like Topsy has been sustained and intellectually girded paradoxically by scientific research and the icons of social science which seems to value evaluation more than that which is to be evaluated. Art education research has been enamored of such factors as respondent conditioning, molar behavior, sensors, quantitative measurement, and sometimes post hoc judgments that contrarily assume a priori conditions. One hardly comes across a feel for gesture in drawing, the laying down of a water color wash, an appreciation of painterly or patinaed surfaces, a comparing of visual rhythms, or a discussion of Francis Bacon's iconography or the color of Matisse. Not surprisingly, the presence and force of art is buried in intellectually clustered irrelevancies. Art educators, in too many instances, have become bemused by the glistening diversions of methodological technology, moving away from the immediacies, the ambiguities, the sometimes startling shocks, the seeming anarchy and uncontrollable surprises and pleasures of art.

This eclecticism has nevertheless had a characteristic theme—an emphasis on process, one fulsomely fertile. It has been regarded almost as a disembodied activity combining a classroom concatenation of creativity, sensory calisthenics, and psychological therapy. Erroneously understood yet borrowed from such dis-

parate and educationally contingent disciplines as physics and psychology, an inordinate importance was put upon process as paradoxically both a problem-solving technique and an end pursued for its own sake. Despite an occasional sophistication and intricacy of theoretical formulation, process in art education has become a sequenced, mechanical notation of the behavioral aspects of what some art educators call "arting" (and they do so not facetiously).

The resulting classroom imbalance has stressed broad stimulation and emphasized motivation, yet held in small esteem the visual image or expressive object conjured up by "creative" inducements. In the helter skelter of this "self-actualizing" creativity, the significance of artistic form, the symbolic communication, the immediacy, and the aesthetic being of the visual metaphors have been minimized or lost. The need for instruction in relating perception to critical appreciation and expression to control of medium and form making has been neglected or rejected. The "art product" has become a throw away image, a ticket to be discarded after the "performance." Like some figurative T.V. tube which accentuates medium over message, the art work of students becomes a palimpsest or *codex inscriptus,* erasable forms which possess supposed psychological and social values rather than artistic or aesthetic ones.

148

The conceptualizing of process as an isolable quality has permitted the educationally inflated purposes and diffused practices which Barzun censures. It parallels some of the confusions and contradictions which characterize the conceptual art widely heralded on the art scene. Both the conceptual art of the seventies and the conceptualizing of process in art education have displaced in some measure the physical sensuousness, as well as the aesthetic nature of art, with pure philosophical premises or perfervid psychological therapeutics. In diminishing or rejecting the intrinsic worth of the aesthetic, the values of art come into question. As a result, for the popular mind the values of art are not defined as personal expressions in metaphor—images of sensibility and meaning directed to oneself and others as persons. Rather, art is regarded as a means addressed to the abstractions of groups, social purposes, and sophistical notions. Richard Wollheim points out as a consequence that, "What art is goes by default . . . art comes to be defined through therapy rather than—as was the original premise—therapy realized through art." We become heir to the many and strange therapeutics which contemporary society indulges. Art education has become studded with engrams of shift-

ing significance and definition, seriously bringing into question its traditionally defensible reasons for existence.

William Gass argues the importance of the arts, "Not for the messages they may contain, not because they expose slavery or cry hurrah for the worker, although such messages in the place and time may be important, but because they insist more than most on their own reality, because of the absolute way in which they exist. . . . Works of art are meant to be lived with and loved, and if we try to understand them, we should try to understand them as we try to understand anyone—in order to know *them* better, not in order to know something else." Whether this understanding, translated into educational terms, is of student creation or appreciation, art education has to accept the Being of art as aesthetic forms independent of other purposes if genuine legitimacy is to be accorded to the discipline.

What is actually at question in art education is whether art is an instrumental activity, an heuristic symbol essentially in service to other aims and goals of school curriculum or an intrinsic engagement with life transforming that experience into an aesthetic sense of order and meaning. We have been operating in art education for the most part on the premise that art is utilitarian, a means of psychological fulfillment and a tool for establishing transferable academic skills. The latest such examples may be seen in reading programs related to art and in the consideration of art as just another basic learning set required in the development of practical coping skills.

The argument for art as possessing basic instrumentalist purposes founders on the very same objections, anxieties, and contradictions with which it is now confronted. Those positive affects of perceptual alertness, sensitivity to pattern and quality, psychomotor dexterity, catharsis, ego satisfaction, and tastefulness do indeed exist. However, they are not the direct result of a rational manipulation of the creative artistic processes, but are the consequence of the more circuitous ambiguities and the symbolic imagination which attend an intrinsic artistic experience. In this, the art object is itself a central element in the experience, a symbolic form with great metaphoric power for meaning and is as self-sufficient as a mathematical equation, a physical law, or a moral precept.

It is in such an independence of knowing or experience that the integrity and significance of art in education can be argued rightfully and its merits declared. When students make art objects and explore aesthetic experiences, they are engaged in a personal per-

spicaciousness and a sensory discernment which project an inner need by relating outside objects to that need and to one another. In choosing and composing the forms, the student (or the artist) makes his need coherent and patterns the outside world in terms of grace and significance. The student is drawn into, not some thoughtless effluvium of spontaneous behavior, but an artistic method exercising organization and control insofar as materials, personal ability, and understanding permit. The expressive need of the student is then caught up in the contingencies of vision, medium, and aesthetic order. The artistic method is completed for the maker as the dynamics of the creation shape the sensation of physical elements into metaphors of artistic form. Experiencing and evaluating such work may be elusive. The process, when not turned aside by tangential concerns, is one of intrinsic search and expressive organization, exciting the intelligence and the emotions, an adventure of the imagination and spirit which evades the cruel controls and necessities which otherwise characterize our need to know and feel. The art work becomes an object of symbolic consistency, making personal and unique sense out of otherwise senseless or chaotic surroundings, providing a pattern of order. The work combines and fuses forms, establishing a unity of elements taken from the endless variety and confusion of the external world. In doing this, the metaphoric power of the forms of art are satisfying and intelligent means of organizing "life's poor play." Art induces epiphanies making the mundane manageable and arranging our emotions so they not only animate our existence but are in some harmony with it. We should not gainsay the insights and understandings of art, ambiguous, inconsistent, and intellectually picaresque as they may be—even if there is no clear, practical academic value apparent.

It was Sir Joshua Reynolds who wrote that "A relish for higher excellencies of art is an acquired taste which no man ever possessed without cultivation." That cultivation can be only providentially acquired outside of formal education. It is a firm responsibility schools must assume, a basic obligation to provide opportunities for aesthetic and metaphoric modes of knowing if large numbers of students are to be afforded balanced, valuable learning experiences. It is not only the need but the nature of artistic cultivation that has been in question. This returns us briefly to basics again, specifically to what is basic to the teaching of art.

The most logical and educationally sound response must deal with Barzun's teachables—those rudiments which underlie the many forms of art—"the root disciplines." This is the only educa-

tionally reasonable approach if we reassert the importance of the product in art education and value art as a self-sufficient discipline. Drawing and design as serious learning disciplines have practically disappeared from the schools, even on the secondary level, in my estimation. There are few, if any, "root discipline" curricular guides in art education similar to what can be found for the Three R's, disputatious as curriculum development has been over the past two decades. Rather, there is in art education what Charles Dorn refers to as "the new eclecticism," which in too many instances is no more than a poor transposition of popular culture, a wooing of the kitsch mentality, and a ruinously uncritical acceptance of "anything you can get away with."

There is a visual foundation to art, and it is perceived as real—as sensory image or object. Even as its qualities may transcend the physical, there is a physical presence which can and should be studied. Though art is not a language in the sense of possessing uniform and conventional symbols that carry shared, communicative meanings, it does possess a grammar of sorts. The color, line, texture, volume, light values, and shapes of which art is literally made are the elements which provide a basis of expressive organization. There are such other discernable features as craft, materials, style, subject matter, tradition, and experimentation which comprise artistic method as well as the more indefinite and obscure considerations of expressive inspiration, creative drive, and intuitions of imagination. Though the latter conditions of art cannot be taught as such, it is possible to get their "feel" through an intelligently ordered perusal and sensitive awareness of the more concrete properties of art.

Art educators need to become teachers of art again, dealing with the actual elements of art, examining its perceivable elements, expounding on its less explicit principles, exploring its tolerance of expressive definition, and explaining its systems of criticism. Then it would be difficult to challenge the validity of art education. It would stand as a core aspect of learning assuming its place in the curriculum as indeed basic to proper education, not replaceable by questionable pedagogical substitutes and necessary to the desirable development of all students.

BACK TO BASICS AND THE PREPARATION OF ART TEACHERS

DIANA KORZENIK
Massachusetts College of Art

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Art educators are not facing the challenge of merging their goals and functions with those of basic or general education for the first time. As Diana Korzenik explains, the historical objectives of education in art have constantly reflected social needs and cultural context. She believes that there is considerable unmined richness in this tradition which we ought to continue to value. The preparation of art teachers, in various institutions which focus on the particular needs of their constituencies, should include careful examination of our professional traditions and the knowledge base to which generations of thinkers and teachers have contributed. Together with a comprehensive understanding of child development and artistic growth, the contemporary art teacher will be well-prepared for meeting the back-to-basics challenge.

1. INTRODUCTION

The "back to basics" movement, as do other social trends, derives from a political reality. The school, as one already overtaxed organ of social change, is being asked to respond to the present crisis of underemployment and inflated dollars. To call it "back to basics" somehow implies that people in recent years were not learning even the basic necessities and that students lacked the basic skills. In general this is probably not the case. In fact, there are far more qualified, skilled people in this society than the society has decided that it can afford to employ. The standards for access to specific jobs are continually rising in order to reduce the huge numbers of people who might otherwise be qualified for the job.

Therefore let us avoid beating our breasts and faulting art education and even education in general. The first three quarters of our century is filled with outstanding general educational innovations of which art-in-education was a central concept. This is true whether we think of The Child Study Movement, Dewey, the W.P.A., Hull House, Lowenfeld, Schaefer-Simmern, or the many professionals on the contemporary scene who contribute ideas today. For this reason we must hear the call of "back to basics" as a cry of apprehension and not confuse it with a response to our own work.

155

If we consider the "back to basics" as a response to something other than our own creation, the question still remains, "How shall we respond?" I recommend that we can best use this moment to scrutinize our profession's past, to see how this point in our social and political history relates to previous developments. Today's crisis can serve as a stimulus for productive inquiry. It may help us put this era in context and may provide awareness of options which suggest or reinforce directions for the preparation of teachers.

2. SCHOOLS AND SOCIAL REMEDIATION

The history of education in America is largely a history of efforts toward social remediation. In the United States, education has not been viewed as a stable set of experiences that was to be the birthright of its citizens. Rather, it was viewed as a tool of building a new country, of building new industries, and of building new citizens as political and social crises demanded. The educational strategies deemed necessary to develop this nation had to be continuously shifting. One example is the notion of universal education. In America this is quite a recent demand. In the nineteenth century, universal tended to mean universal for boys. Girls weren't even

counted in enrollment statistics. Even today, schools that claim to serve everyone are sometimes found to have excluded from ten to twelve percent of children specifically amongst the poor, American Indian, and Black, as well as those who are emotionally and physically handicapped. Serving these populations and providing equality of educational opportunity for them are enormous tasks of as yet unaccomplished social remediation.

The history of art education in this country must be viewed within the context of social demands of American education as a whole. Thus we see that each accomplishment was supported by the society only when it could be demonstrated that it provided a possible solution to a social, political, or economic problem. A retrospective view of art education reveals a poignant, continuous process of redefinition and rejustification that seemed necessary in order for the profession to continue to exist. We must be aware of our tendencies and our vulnerabilities as we tend to shift our purposes with every shifting social pressure. Given the fact that the history of art education in this country traces an ever-changing set of directions, we shall first scan the major objectives that have dominated the ideology of the field. Second, we shall analyze the function of different institutions and the constituencies they serve, to see how they may exert leadership in preparing teachers. Third, accepting the varieties of objectives and institutions, we shall propose what may be a productive response to contemporary society's demands for "back to basics."

3. OBJECTIVES

If all the objectives and procedures that held sway at one time or another in American art education were all advocated and implemented simultaneously, we would have an enormously rich educational system. Art education embraces a range of objectives that aims to foster a variety of behaviors. The shifting mastery of one or another of these behaviors throughout the history of art education can be understood as a function of the consciously or unconsciously selected educational objective. Objectives may be understood as what people believed were the effects of various processes on the people who made them. The dominance of one procedure over another in any period may be understood as a function of what each procedure was believed to be able to accomplish in response to what the society valued.

It is convenient to divide teaching objectives into three broad categories. The first objective is called the *pedagogical,* wherein art is a means of knowing, whether it be Jean-Jacques Rousseau

helping Emile understand a leaf by drawing it, John Dewey advocating exploring and then constructing one's neighborhood, Don Brigham suggesting the search for visual analogies in the structure of knowledge, or Harvard's Project Zero investigations of cognition involved in the mastery of the drawing process itself.

Through the pedagogical objective, the manipulation of materials is seen as central to the comprehension of the world. Object-making and thought are seen as inseparable processes. Object-making requires symbolization of thought within a medium. The process of forming is seen as essential to the assimilation and expression of knowledge. The pedagogical objective seems to unify the goals of the art teacher with those of all the other teachers, with the key distinction being the medium of expression.

All methods that equate art-making and language as a vehicle of expression might be included under this objective. Perhaps the paradigm of the pedagogical objective is Francis Parker's "theory of concentrations." Parker categorized knowledge into three branches: biological, physical, and social scientific. For Parker, gesture, music, written language, speech, drawing, painting, and modeling were equivalent and adequate means of exploration and definition of concepts within the three branches of knowledge.[1]

When the pedagogical objective has been dominant, there have been severe concerns about children's understanding of the basic school subjects. But when art teachers adopted the pedagogical objective, the very justification for the employment of art teachers was challenged. The charge was that any classroom teacher could teach social studies concepts through art! Even Parker, at one point, advocated the elimination of the art teacher to further the expansion of art in the curriculum. The threat is strikingly familiar today, when art teachers are increasingly seeking collaboration with classroom teachers. Now the art teacher is challenged to prove his or her uniqueness. Within the otherwise healthy collaboration of art and the rest of the curriculum and in spite of what very exciting teaching and learning that may be going on, there is a subtle turn away from the pedagogical objective.

To what do we turn? The *utilitarian* objective always serves to demonstrate that work with the hands provides education with something quite different and necessary. It provides an opportunity to build skills that are demanded in the world of work. Toward the middle of the 19th century, with the start of the Common Schools in this country, utilitarian objectives gained prominence. Horace Mann's *Common School Journal* recommended the drawing techniques of the Prussian educator Peter Schmidt. Schmidt advocated

observing predetermined arrangements of blocks and following charted sequences of line paths to reproduce the relationships of the observed edges of the blocks. Mann believed this drawing technique was productive school work that would provide skills for occupations. He recognized the power of drawing, but feared that if restless young hands and minds were left undirected, drawing might deteriorate into mere picture making!

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century Walter Smith, who developed the first art teacher training institution in America, provided another form of utilitarian visual training in his drawing exercises via copy books. The legislature of the State of Massachusetts had been lobbied into establishing an art school to train designers and teachers of future designers for the industrial mills of New England. The copy book procedures were believed to generate skills that were essential components of work.

Other utilitarian aspects of art education may be seen in the interpretation of the concept of work. One contribution provided by John Dewey is his concept of the psychology of occupations. "Occupation as thus conceived must therefore be distinguished from work which educates primarily for a trade. It differs because its end is in itself; in the growth that comes from the continual interplay of ideas and their embodiment in action, not in external utility.[2] Dewey saw children's occupations as demanding intellectual responsibility through the choice of materials, as well as providing an opportunity to think through one's own plan of work, to recognize one's mistakes, and to correct them. This involvement with occupations parallels the historical development of the culture, and thereby is a recapitulation of the social function of work in the society at large.

In a recent article by Phyllis Ewen, art-making is contrasted with industrial work.[3] Achievement in art is a self-directed, self-paced undertaking, the compietion of which is the decision of the artist. Achievement in industrial work is paced by managers, generally completed to predetermined specifications determined by managers. The art-making activity thus can be seen to contribute to society a much-needed sense of autonomy and responsibility in work. The utilitarian objective of education thus can use art as a model of a threatened form of work. Broadly speaking, then, the utilitarian objective may help define how, where, and when art-making processes may be models of adult work.

One of the problems with utilitarian objectives in American schools is that it has become increasingly clear that work with the hands is only valued by and for certain strata of the society. It can-

not be claimed that all young men and women in the society will be performing work with their hands. The utilitarian focus of education thus has lost favor except in vocational or trade school programs which serve an already identified working class segment of the society. The stigma against working with the hands, and working with materials has been well documented by Arnheim[4] and is part of a vast problem of social statification which the profession of art educators can only recognize, but hardly alter.

Finally there is a third form of objective in art education that may be labelled the *spiritual/aesthetic* objective. Here art-making may be understood to provide an experience which is unique to art. The spiritual aesthetic objective tends to be based on assumptions about human nature. For example, Bronson Alcott, a nineteenth century educator, believed that the spirit with which children were endowed made them ready to interpret life from their earliest years. The inborn creative, human spirit is seen as craving opportunities for aesthetic expression. This expression enables the learner to reflect on his or her own humanness and to understand his or her likenesses and differences from other human beings. For Rudolf Steiner and the Waldorf School movement, art was the spiritualizing, humanizing, educative vehicle for all other forms of learning. For Herbert Read, art was the vehicle through which we could become a community of human beings through maximizing our differences and yet making them shareable. The aesthetic, spiritual objectives have generally left American educators exceedingly uncomfortable. Since American society seems to be determined to divorce meaning from events, it is obvious that the aesthetic/spiritual objective will have little place in the over-all program of social remediation to which our schools have always been devoted.

4. TEACHER PREPARATION

The choice of objectives of art education programming are largely a function of the decision about what is valuable and needed within the society. Teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities have a unique opportunity to shape the policy and the programming. In order to see how teacher preparation institutions may interpret and respond to social needs, we need to understand the nature of these specific educational settings.

In reviewing professional preparation, the institutional setting with its particular features—its unique geographical, demographical, political, and economic realities—become central determinants of the range of possible choices. The program that prepares teachers grows in a context. It grows in a city, a suburban, or a rural en-

vironment. Each setting has features that are not just unique to that type but unique to that place. In a recent comparison of two similar East Coast urban art colleges, it became quite clear that different kinds of learning experiences could flourish in each institution as a function of the features of each respective city.

Another aspect of an institution of higher education is its structure. Is it a college or is it a university? Are we dealing with an art department, art education department, or an education department that will prepare art teachers? What is its historical sense of mission? Why was the institution established? How have its resources been allocated and justified? What is the institution's concept of its community? To whom does it expect to provide services? Does it view community as the nation, the state, or the immediate neighborhood? Some institutions propose policy for the nation, others respond to guidelines from federal and state offices, while others concentrate on providing direct community services as rapidly as they can be identified.

In spite of the varieties of institutions that may determine the priorities and selection of objectives, it is necessary that each share a common understanding of what the field of art education is, has been, and may become. At the present time such consensus seems lacking. I propose that in order to respond to the current "back to basics" or any other hew and cry, we who prepare teachers first must have an understanding of what our field is, of its body of knowledge, and of its past achievements. Then we can build upon what we are, rather than shift course when any new trend or social demand comes along. Institutional responses, though directed to different constituencies, may arise from a common basis of what the field's capacities are.

What might provide a core of knowledge and inform students of the *content* within our ever-changing field? Perhaps there are two parts: history and human development, Nietszche said "History is necessary above all to the man of action and power who fights a fight and needs examples, teachers and comforters: he cannot find them among his contemporaries. . . . What is the use to the modern man of this "monumental" contemplation of the past? . . . It is the knowledge that the great thing existed and is therefore possible, and so may be possible again."[5] He characterizes his culture which had venerated history too much to the point that the past had ceased to have reality and to invigorate the living. In our era, in spite of our libraries and museums, we are currently engaged in a curiously ahistoric era, characterized by absorption with the uniqueness of ourselves and our time. The history of education, the

history of art, and the history of art education might provide templates through which we, as living individuals, may compare our experiences. Each idea must be understood as a function of its time, though also in the light of both older and newer ideas.

We can only really value the richness of our inheritance of such writers as Viktor Lowenfeld, for example, by reading him historically. His contribution is uniquely determined as a function of his entry and exit points in time. The evolution of his concepts of visual and haptic types grew out of the issues of his culture at the time. Eugene Feldman has pointed out that Lowenfeld's types developed out of the cultural disquiet that Northern art theorists felt about Italian painting.[6] How could there be two cultural renaissances, each producing great works, when one produced works that looked so illusionistic (Italian) and the other did not (Northern)? Rather than conclude that the lack of illusion is equivalent to inferiority, theorists in the North strove to articulate a theory of different artistic-cultural types, thereby preserving the argument of value for their own culture. Lowenfeld's work is illuminated, when we understand how he struggled with these issues of his culture and incorporated them in his view of haptic and visual child art.

Our mythology about our cultural progress had lead us to ignore the past. We tend to smile or ridicule the efforts of our predecessors. History shows examples of how art was understood to lead to new values in the culture. It illuminates archetypal conflicts that still afflict us. Perhaps most importantly it places the efforts of contemporary thinkers in context with other people at other times. It makes us all look equally mortal while also demanding of us vision and courage to pursue what we believe to be valuable. One of my students in History of Art Education interrupted a class discussion when she suddenly wanted to express what she had come to understand. She said, "You know, I always thought education was to tell you about what was, about people who were important. Somehow now I understand that history is about putting oneself into the future, seeing that I too am one of those people who affects the world!" The effect of the study of history is to empower the living.

Given the historical, social context of art as one part of the core of our field, it needs to be complemented by a second part, child/adolescent/human development. The study of child development focuses teachers-to-be on the client. Whether or not we shall be teaching children, all learners are people who once were children. How we acquired our skills and how we felt about this mastery is inseparable from our mode of learning in later life. Child development,

as a subject of study, may be useful to artist-educators because we uniquely revive and use our own childhood in art-making. It may help us respect the child within us, to tap into our own sensory, concrete experience and attitudes toward the physical world which never ceases to be part of art-making. Our understanding of our own childhood may provide a reservoir from which one can draw teaching strategies that match the developmental needs of the learner.

Study of the developing child informs us of the emergence of symbolization as a universal human function. Symbolization, the description of things and actions of the world, is central to all human growth. Through child study, we can consider the role of play on non-verbal symbolization and of its relation to language and numerical concepts. Symbolization in childhood provides an opportunity for intelligent activity which may or may not lead to later interest and/or abilities in artistic activity.

Child development also instructs us in the different powers of art-making at different stages of life. The developing and changing interest in symbolization taps into the most intimate emotional and cognitive interests of the child. Imagery develops from personal needs and wishes at each stage. Imagery and meaning in the process of mural painting is quite a different experience for a group of seven year olds than it is for a group of fourteen year olds.

Because each transformation in developmental stages is common to a general degree, it is possible to recognize what is common to many as well as what is unique to the individual. Through familiarity with developmental norms, an observer is able to recognize the exceptions. An art teacher who is well-trained in child development should be able to recognize both the exceptionally mature as well as developmentally disabled child.

Finally, since child development is a body of knowledge that is intended to be non-interventionist, it only aims to describe what is. This enhances its value to us. It leaves us, as art educators, free to raise questions about what ought to be. It provides enough room for teachers to decide what objectives within art education are most valuable to pursue. It is possible to argue that the pursuit of one objective is best in early childhood, whereas a shift in objectives is necessary in middle childhood, and then later again in working with adolescents, and later again with various stages of adulthood. The teacher's grasp of the concept of the changing culture (history) and the changing client (human development) can facilitate the choice of any particular intervention.

To summarize, I am claiming that we who prepare art teachers

must establish a core of knowledge that is constant across time, that will not be abandoned with each new trend. With this core of knowledge of our field as common to all teacher preparation institutions, we may then respond to our environment, to our institutional mission, and to our different constituencies as we deem appropriate. The response to new waves of social demands may take the form of policy recommendations or the form of providing, say, neighborhood storefront art centers. Either response would be informed by an understanding of what our field is and has accomplished. Actions would fit into larger visions. Institutional responses may all be equally valid, though directed to different constituencies, if all responses were informed by an expansive understanding of the role of education in the society and the nature of children's development.

5. TODAY'S DEMANDS

How should we, as preparers of teachers, respond to the "back to basics" movement, against the background of social remediation in American education, and the shifting dominance of objectives to serve social and political purposes?

If we took the words, "back to basics" at their surface meaning, we could assume art teachers should be devising means of teaching reading, writing, science, and mathematics through visual means. We would expect some educators to argue that some people must learn visually, that there are "visual learners" whose language and mathematical skills will improve with appropriate art-making. We would also expect that people might hearken back to what is known about symbolization in early childhood, and encourage all types of form-making that demand analysis and ordering of life experiences leading to articulate verbal expression. The art educator might even be seeking justification in neurology for what has always been obvious, that some people labeled as "learning disabled" learn, thrive, and succeed through visual information and visual expression. Doesn't this all sound familiar?

But what if we chose *not* to interpret the surface demands behind "back to basics" and looked further at the socio-economic roots of the anger and discontent of the society? What if we looked at our society's failure to continue to generate the illusion of progress, and the disappointment in self-improvement that promised to lead to work opportunities? What then does the profession of art education have to offer?

My hope for our profession is that we do not set up an either/or

situation. With an understanding of history, of our cultural stresses and strengths, and with an understanding of the nature of childhood, we should be able to see what is valid and necessary to accomplish in both of these interpretations.

I resist the pressure to redefine art education once again. Too much of value is in our history that can directly inform our response to present demands. Placing the "back to basics" movement within the history of art education demonstrates that we already have lived through and investigated many of the important questions. Art education already can provide examples from its past of productive ways of involving art in basic education. We need not be defensive and alter our sense of ourselves. We know we already have a tradition that can supply us with useful examples.

In order for teacher preparation programs to respond to "back to basics" appropriately, we must therefore be able to integrate it into a body of knowledge that we find valid across time. The historical view of our profession should lead us to acknowledge that we have been serving the development of intelligence, of basic cognitive skills. We have been training thinking-in-materials throughout varieties of objectives, through providing the rarest of opportunities in schools—the combined work of mind and hands.

It is our responsibility to share our knowledge with our colleagues in other areas of education. The "back to basics" movement may lead us to review, understand, and then make a better explanation, a better case, of what art may provide.

Hopefully, our awareness of historical shifts in our own profession may inhibit our natural inclination to reject what we just endorsed. Hopefully the plethora of objectives in art education will strengthen our conviction about the richness of our field.

Finally, it is essential that we continue to question and seek to understand what art-making teaches. Studies should examine the role of medium and the role of form-making in human development. What the years of studio work teach has hardly been understood in this society. The role of thinking through a medium at any age needs to be observed, analyzed, and connected to the range of learning enterprises valued by schools.

Since schools must inevitably respond to social pressures, we can use this moment to understand the enormous range of opportunities that art education provides. The history of our field demonstrates this, but we must remain conscious and selective about our present choices without rejecting the richness of our past.

REFERENCES

1. Frederick Logan, *The Growth of Art in American Schools,* New York: Harper & Row, 1955.
2. John Dewey, *The School and Society,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900, p. 133.
3. Phyllis Ewen, "Art-Making: An Alternative to Work," *The Journal,* Massachusetts College of Art, Spring 1976.
4. Rudolf Arnheim, *Visual Thinking,* Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1969.
5. Frederick Nietzsche, *The Use and Abuse of History,* New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1949, pp. 20-22.
6. Edmund Feldman, Personal correspondence, November 1978.

WHAT DO TEACHERS NEED TO MAKE ART BASIC?

ROGENA M. DEGGE
The Ohio State University

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Development of adequate art education programs has been hampered in many schools by inadequate concepts of teacher preparation. Rogena Degge describes the afflictions resulting from narrow notions of what constitutes a satisfactory experience in art, including lack of significant content and missed opportunities for integration with other subject areas. She proposes more demanding certification courses and a more expansive in-service training experience. Only by making the preparation of teachers more rigorous and meaningful are we likely to introduce rigor and meaning into school art education programs.

137

Making recommendations for teacher preparation programs in light of the "back to basics" movement is a challenge I welcome even at the risk of saying we must "come to our senses," but with the hope of avoiding the contradictory rhetoric of the so-named publication. Because the "back to basics" rifle is aimed and fired at public school programs, the emphasis here will be in that arena. Others, in this publication and elsewhere, eloquently and varyingly speak to how the arts are basic. We should thoughtfully study the various positions on the "basicness" of art for their logical and forward-looking qualities, to adopt more comprehensive premises around which to develop programs and direct students who will be teaching art.

The chapter has two major parts. The first is a very personal recounting of what I observe to be the state of art teaching and the content of art programs in the majority of classrooms across the nation. The perceptions will be generalized and will lack quantifiable data for substantiation. They are grounded, rather, in an extended period of personal contacts and experiences, and reinforced by the more than 200 students who have been critical participant observers for me the past four years. Although the virtues of repetition are well known, this descriptive portion may seem redundant to many who have described and lamented over the lack of quality and narrow scope of what often passes for art education. It does, however, offer a point-of-view context to support the presumption that the *effects* of existing programs on the perceptions of "others" are one important reason why the value of including art in the general education programs of youngsters is not recognized.

The second part of this chapter presents some practical short and long term suggestions for those of us conducting teacher preparation programs. These are offered as a means by which we may affect how art is valued, through how it is taught—that whatever is put into practice in the name of art education is a step toward altering the perceptions of others through *demonstrating* how art is basic to general education programs in our schools.

INFAMOUS PRACTICES: THE UPSHOT

At the elementary school level, the art specialist, though never in great quantity, seems to have survived only in the wealthy or more conscientious communities where financial plights and apparently insupportable test scores have stirred communities to what has come to be called the "back to basics" movement. Faced with financial crises, elementary teachers, given the option to lose either

the music or art teacher, have felt they could teach art easier than music because their students don't perceive their ignorance as easily, or, as I was told firsthand, they "don't need to know as much." Periodic visits to elementary classrooms and conversations with those teachers reveal they are still almost completely without knowledge of good resources and have no appreciable background in how to plan and implement substantive art learning experiences for their students, beyond the exploration of a few materials. The elementary teacher still relies almost solely on and feels most secure with the kinds of resources which show how to lead students through projects according to specified instructions, or which provide three alternative methods for doing fingerpaintings.[1] This state of affairs is an irritatingly persistent one. According to some teachers, their required art education course(s) for elementary education majors still emphasizes this approach. At least it seems to be what they remember of the course. And what they remember is part of this significant issue.

What has come to be known as art at the elementary level is represented by the various and often craft-related projects and their resultant products. Elementary teachers apparently believe this is what art for youngsters is supposed to be. We understand how they might have arrived at this belief, not only because their resource books support such notions, but also due to their own past experiences as students making projects in elementary school as well as the teachers they observed during their training.

Parents and administrators, as well as the children, also acquire these limited concepts regarding elementary art. Many people realize that children enjoy and look forward to art but that ultimately it may have little to do with the general education of the child, particularly that which is "basic." Even if we ignore the inadequate standards being presently used to determine what is "basic" to the elementary aged child's education and provide our own criteria, we cannot, in good conscience, support art as it is taught in most elementary classrooms.

There are some commendable elementary art education programs taught by knowledgeable teachers. I believe that the number is small. Their students learn about art: about artists and architects—their lives, their works, their contributions to humankind; about other cultures and subcultures—what their art may mean or may tell us about their beliefs, their values, their uniqueness; about the relationships between art and the designed environment and between art and the society, and the impact of these for individuals and groups. They learn to perceive the world in more special ways

through careful guidance in looking and drawing—to see its beauty and ugliness more easily. And they explore the various new and traditional materials artists use, getting involved in making things—extending the imagination and testing their creative and problem-solving potentials. Such teachers have little trouble justifying the value of these programs. Parents and administrators are aware of what is being learned and its importance. But it must be apparent that one course in art education methods is hardly adequate to prepare elementary teachers with the breadth of knowledge necessary to teach about art credibly.

At the secondary level the junior high or middle school art programs generally differ from those in high schools in several ways. Junior high art is often required for a semester or year, and offered additionally as an elective. Art is not required of most senior high school students. Junior high art programs are primarily "general art" courses where students have the opportunity to explore an array of materials while doing various "art projects." The familiar process-product approach is still the orientation in most junior high and high school classes whether the lessons are planned and presented by the teacher for the whole class to do similarly, or the teacher lists a choice of projects from which students make their choices. In one junior high class, observed for ten weeks, where the total focus was process-product centered with a craft emphasis, a list was taped to a cupboard and changed every six to eight weeks. One such list read: "candlemaking, leather, linoleum printing, ringmaking, needle-point, weaving, woodcarving, and magic box" (made with cardboard hexagons). The introduction of the new list was accompanied by what the teacher called her "pitch" whereby all the listed items were explained in one forty minute period. During the remaining weeks the students picked from the list and, without any substantive guidance regarding ideas or planning, received from the teacher only some technical guidance and help with supplies. Student learning was evaluated solely on involvement in class—how busy and interested they appeared.[2] The students placed little or no value on the class. We could expect no more of administrators and parents. Surely, if their children's and their own elementary and junior high school art experiences resembled these descriptions, art would understandably not emerge, for many, as *basic* to the junior high student's education, even though a mandated requirement at this level has been achieved in many states.

Some high schools may have programs that approximate the junior high descriptions. The trend, however, is to imitate the art

school or college studio approach. A representative sample of what their curriculum guides might list is: Introduction to Art, Painting I and Advanced Painting, Crafts I and II, Drawing I and II, Commercial Art, Ceramics, Sculpture, and Printmaking. Some are even more specialized, where a course like watercolor painting is offered, as it was in college in the 1950's and 1960's. Emphasis is on mastery of tools and materials, and making objects that reflect good composition and craftsmanship. Elements and principles of design are stressed. Ideas of *what* to make often come from magazine pictures because technique is the focus of learning. Yearly district-wide art shows perpetuate these singular approaches by offering prizes to those students who meet these criteria most exactingly.

Art courses in most high schools are designed for the talented or highly self-motivated student, and especially cater to those considering a career in art, even though others do enroll. Students seeking a non-threatening or therapeutic environment or those who have learned to regard the grade in art as unimportant also enroll, as do the curious and those with no other reasonable options. Even though the art teacher may quite readily welcome and work with these students, the studio-based program cannot begin to address the rights of these students to a broader, general education in art. The belief that the study of art in public schools is commensurate with making art is so pervasive that in fact there is at least one high school where student teachers are only acceptable if their studio skills are exceptional. No other art knowledge is a criteria. Only a few students with B.F.A. or M.F.A. degrees returning for certification, or dual degree students, honestly meet the criteria. It is true that there are some high school art teachers who have introduced classes in art appreciation and criticism for advanced art students, and arts and humanities courses for the general school population. These courses are separate from and in addition to the studio selections. Other exceptions are the teachers who design their art classes upon the premise that learning about art should be the prerogative of all students—that courses in making art are appropriate for some, but that many other art courses are appropriate for more. Making art is relegated to a more balanced place in the curriculum.

One such program has course offerings that include studying the social impact as well as aesthetic and technical aspects of film and television; studying contemporary and other art; and artists—what they are like, what they accomplish, and why their work becomes important. The students read and talk and look a lot. They make art, too, but in the context of learning about the larger impact

140/a

of art—for them personally, for others, and on their environment. The students in these classes seem to comprehend a relationship between themselves and art much more than those in studio-based programs. Surely this direction in teaching art, whether in high schools, junior high, or elementary schools, comes closer to meeting the general education needs and interests of students and to what would be considered basic in a student's public school education.

To reiterate: The perceptions generally held by the vast majority of people in our country is that enrolling in or being taught art at the public school level means using materials and tools and making things. These perceptions are reinforced by what is actually emphasized at all levels of art teaching. The majority of teachers teaching art today, whether certified in art or not, develop and present their courses on this premise. The resulting products that are taken home or displayed in exhibits, because they are too often the only evidence of what the class is about, do not make a convincing case for how studying art might contain basic and valued experiences for children and youth. We may say that neither does the completed math assignment provide an argument for math as basic. But, that math is already considered basic removes the relevancy of the analogy here, though not the logic.

What all this may suggest is that the teacher preparation programs in most colleges today are not succeeding in preparing teachers for the broader, more comprehensive approaches to teaching art advocated by leaders in our field. I suspect this is not true, in many instances, although a little Lowenfeld still seems to go a long way in some programs. What faces us is, rather, a perplexing set of conditions. I'll address only a few.

Our aspiring teachers come to us after having art experiences all through public school and college that have reinforced that art teaching is teaching as I have described. In some cases, when we point out what they've missed, they are angry and feel cheated. Most state certification requirements perpetuate parochial concepts as well, and, in fact, seem designed to most comfortably accommodate the fine arts major who opts for certification. These requirements don't reflect what most art educators believe is even minimally necessary or sufficient as preparation for designing and teaching a more inclusive art program.

In some states, an increasing number of hours is being required in the field prior to student teaching. The rationale for that is obvious, but additional cooperating teachers become essential to meet these field hour demands. We have some excellent models,

140/6

but those who reflect enlightened art teaching practices are far fewer than is required in most college communities. Thus, some of our "models" are detrimental to our goals, even telling our students that the kind of teaching we may propose can't be implemented. *Proof* of the feasibility of what we propose seems essential along with pointing out the means by which to do it. And, unless we concurrently and convincingly point out to our preparing teachers the shortcomings of those programs which are narrow in approach, we can expect little change in how art is taught and therefore little change in the attitudes about the breadth and value of learning available in art classes.[3] Yet it is also the case that art teachers are doing a poor job of what they are teaching, and that the content of their curricula is imbalanced to a point of perpetuating the perceptions that I've proposed keep us from advancing the role of art programs in schools and implementing the tenets of aesthetic education—a more convincingly "basic" educational direction, in my opinion.[3]

SOME BASICS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION

For years it has been our concern to convince others of the basic and unique educational contributions the study of art offers. Calls for change in art teaching practices have been urged by many writers, long before the "back to basics" movement emerged. Perhaps this movement and recent concerns about the potential damage the Rockefeller Report brings to our efforts[4] will stir us to action as never before. I don't presume to propose that what follows are the necessary and sufficient components to alter the non-basic place to which art has been relegated in the school curriculum. I do believe, however, that the recommendations represent a few logical and potentially effective steps toward both ameliorating the negative perceptions of others and increasing the quality of what is taught in the name of art education.

Our challenges in the schools at both the elementary and secondary levels are multiple. As situations and beliefs presently exist, we cannot soon expect art specialists to increase in numbers in the elementary schools across our nation. We can, however, improve the quality of what is taught there by increasing our in-service offerings, going to elementary teachers wherever they may welcome us, offering quarterly and even yearly post-graduate course work on an after-school basis and for college credit. Even though these extended periods of time would be far from sufficient to develop these generalists into art specialists, the time spent with elementary teachers in their teaching environment becomes a more

effective means of teaching them about art, about how it can contribute to their students' basic education, and how to offer educationally sound art learning to their students. When instruction of this kind takes place in a school over a period of time with a number of teachers and perhaps even a principal involved, interest appears to increase through sharing. Better art teaching occurs more frequently in the school—partly from increased knowledge which produces confidence, but also through peer pressure among the teachers.

Expanding the length of service to local elementary schools from two-hour workshops once a year to regular course offerings must necessarily be accompanied by instruction substantive enough that we can be relatively certain that the teachers will have made an appreciable shift in understanding what art teaching is, and that they can, to some degree, put that learning into words as well as into practice. As they begin to understand the differences and accept the challenge, their need for an art specialist to fill the deficiencies in their students' educations will very likely become more apparent. But whether this does or does not occur, or whether they could get a specialist if they wanted one, we could feel relatively certain that what would occur in the name of art in their classrooms would subsequently have greater meaning for their students.

Our responsibilities regarding teacher preparation necessarily extends to providing more in-service for art teachers as well. Offering courses centered on convincing, plausible, and responsible arguments for more basic programmatic offerings, as well as the means by which to design them, should be high on our agenda.

In the art education courses offered undergraduate elementary education majors, we perpetuate that which we condemn when insisting that a majority or even an equal portion of their coursework include learning about materials and processes. To change attitudes and alter beliefs acquired over the years requires a stronger commitment to change these courses. The frustration that accompanies trying to approach this task with success, considering one course is generally all that is required of elementary education majors, has no doubt been a deterrent to changing the formats. The challenge is compounded by the students' general apprehensiveness about the course which, as a result, they often put off taking because of their self-perception of inadequate talent or creativity. This entry attitude coupled with their expectations to primarily work with papier maché, clay, tissue paper, and the like, clearly demonstrates our obligation to provide them with sounder attitudes and

knowledge to apply in their first teaching position.

Many art education faculties are small in number. Often there is only one member. Because whatever is minimally sufficient to provide the minimum art education required for those seeking certification is often the criteria that determines faculty size, we surmise, probably accurately, that the size reflects the college or university's perceptions of the importance of a general education in art. Having acknowledged these limitations, I quickly add that these absolve no one in facing the challenges before us.

Art education majors, because they have learned a lot about art materials and techniques and some art history by the time they enroll in most art education courses, have concepts of what teaching art is in general education that are similar to non-art peoples' concepts. To alter those to a sufficient degree that their teaching will be different than their previous "models" and will reflect the basic tenets we hope would be practiced in art classrooms, requires incorporating carefully planned components into their coursework and fieldwork. Considering what is basic and desirable for art education students would seem to be a prerequisite to developing art teachers that are, in this era, capable of transmitting with confidence the significance of the art learning they provide. Fundamental, then, would be (1) that we believe art should be treated as a basic and general subject of study at *all* school levels, (2) that it is essential to determine what these basic elements are, and (3) that we present our beliefs lucidly and logically enough for our students to comprehend them, feel a commitment to support them, and put them into practice.

A great strength to be developed in most of our students is the ability not only to teach well but to convincingly speak as well as write about their teaching goals, purposes, and accomplishments. Evidence of what is being learned in their classrooms and its value necessarily must be communicated in ways others can understand. Teachers confident that what they are teaching is important, or basic, and who understand their responsibilities to their students seem to more easily and comfortably communicate that to others, including their students. Helping our art education students understand the importance and responsibility of establishing on-going and substantive talk with their students, parents, and administrators about what is being learned and its value seems a necessary step in altering the perceptions of others. Components built into their coursework that develop those skills seem a step toward accomplishing fuller awareness.

The potential impact of *models* on aspiring teachers is also of

value. It would seem advantageous to make available a number of exemplary models of art teaching recorded on videotape. Careful selection and familiarity with the settings and the models' instructional methods and programs would necessarily be part of the effort to alter the underdeveloped perceptions our students may have regarding their responsibilities as teachers. The more rigorously students are asked to critically study and evaluate these practices, verbally and in writing—comparing teachers to other teachers and to the doctrines we want to advance—the closer they may come to understanding the differences. Understanding the differences would seem a step toward insuring that our future teachers might teach art as more foundational to their students' education.

At this point I would like to avoid the prescriptive approach I sense is emerging here, and turn, in these final paragraphs, to some related and perhaps equally large issues regarding teacher preparation and the question of "basics". One such issue is that over the past decade, a rapidly increasing number of preschool and daycare programs have opened all over this country. Although figures seem to vary, it is safe to say that approximately 13 million pre-school aged children are enrolled in either a preschool program (defined as those programs supplemental to the home) or in a group daycare setting (defined as the home replacement). In the preschools, some kind of art or "art time" is frequently included in the day's events, planned and led by persons with very different amounts of education and with very limited knowledge about art. Of course preschool education is a relatively new field, and curricula are highly experimental. Education specialists are only in the early stages of determining what are appropriate experiences and learning for 2,3, and 4 year olds. But, as more preschool programs are opened as places for supplemental learning, and as an increasing number of daycare programs move from their custodial formats to the present trend of providing programs developmental in focus, the greater will be our obligation to consider art education's role in this very basic part of a child's education.

Similar obligations seem emanent regarding the role of art in the educational development of the handicapped, the ill, the incarcerated, and the elderly. The question of what is basic looms large as do the implications for teacher preparation. The rights of these people to the educational and aesthetic experiences available in art education, as well as those vocational and therapeutic, seem commensurate to the considerations of what else is basic or important educationally for these persons.

Central to our role in and response to this "back to basics" era is that we grasp firmly a premise that introduces art into the lives of students in a meaningful and educational manner, whatever their age or condition—where art promotes positive growth and becomes the basis for enhancing the quality of life.

REFERENCES

1. Books such as Wankelman and Wiggs' *A Handbook of Arts and Crafts* become the resources for the *content* of elementary art programs rather than just for recipes for bread dough and fingerpaint. Books like this, by their craft-product approach, not only appeal to the naive elementary teacher but also reinforce the misconceptions that their contents represent art education. Counteracting those perceptions has been difficult. The mere introduction of such resources lights up the faces of aspiring and practicing elementary teachers. Weeks and months of effort are required to adequately instill in them the seldom necessary but proper use of such publications.
2. In 1974 I spent one quarter of the school year daily observing this teacher and her students. The efforts culminated in a doctoral dissertation titled "A Case Study and Theoretical Analysis of the Art Teaching Practices in One Junior High School." As a resource it has been invaluable as a partial preparation of undergraduates to do critical observations in their assigned field experiences. While I rightly claimed in the document that the teacher was not to be regarded as representative, much of what she did is typical practice.

3. At our state and national art education conferences we are still guilty of giving two messages. While we have addresses, panels, and research reports to advance the state of art education, we offer media workshops for the public school teachers. Offering these on such a grand scale, we need not wonder why they regard this as the appropriate and generally sufficient content of their programs. Can we wonder, either, why they'd think what we are promoting is irrelevant as they perceive their responsibilities as art teachers?
4. Reference here is to the writings and orations of Acuff, Chapman, and Lanier, among others, which enlighten us to the dangerous and flawed, and by now, highly familiar publication *Coming to Our Senses.* See.

   Bette Acuff, "Using Our Heads While Coming to Our Senses," *Studies,* Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 33-40.

   Laura H. Chapman, "Coming to Our Senses: Beyond the Rhetoric," *Art Education,* Vol. 31, No. 1, 1978, pp. 4-9.

   Vincent Lanier, "The Trojan Horse of Glass: A Cabalistic Theory of Recent Developments in Art Education," *Art Education,* Vol. 31, No. 6, 1978, pp. 12-15.

ARTS, POLITICS, AND CHANGE IN THE SCHOOLS*

THOMAS A. HATFIELD
South Carolina Department of Education

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Change in the schools need not have adverse impact on the arts if arts educators recognize the need for effective planning, coordination, and political activity. Thomas Hatfield spells out various managerial aspects of the current educational scene, encouraging arts educators to awaken to their economic potential and political potency. By organizing and working together, especially at the local level, arts educators can create sound administrative and management foundations for parity of the arts in school programs.

---

*This article is based on a presentation made at the Arts Education Conference co-sponsored by the New Hampshire State Department of Education and the New Hampshire Alliance for Arts Education in October 1978.

It is high fashion these days to use words or phrases such as "arts education," "comprehensive arts," "related arts," "unified arts," "interdisciplinary arts" and so on. When the arts are combined under such umbrella terms, there is always a problem of maintaining the identity and integrity of each art discipline. At present, only art and music have established programs, while dance and theatre have limited development, especially at elementary levels. Because of the vagueness of such terms, many definitions have surfaced and art educators may fear their discipline will be swallowed up or diluted within the "arts" movement. But art, music, theatre, and dance do exist as separate disciplines. Each has singular modes, unique characteristics, and separate identities. As such, each should be valued for its contribution to the educational enterprise.

Although there have been a number of recent attempts to connect the arts to other areas of learning, such efforts have primarily focused on the content of the curriculum, not the persuasion used for expanding the political base for arts education at the local level. More specifically, my premise is that all arts educators, elementary and secondary, can work together to develop a solid political and persuasive base for arts education in their school districts. This is best achieved when each arts discipline has strong, identifiable, and discrete programs. Such programs then provide a solid foundation to explore relationships with other arts, other areas, or new audiences. Although it is not my intent to deal with definitions here, I suspect one of our major problems is that there is no widespread agreement about *what is arts education?* Such a question needs to be asked, especially at the local level, to clarify our own beliefs and attitudes, and our major concerns about the status of arts education. Too many local arts educators limit their concerns to budget, equipment, scheduling, and materials. These are, of course, necessary ingredients to provide programming, but are poor substitutes for goals when the political push comes to shove. In the following pages I will examine various considerations leading to a better understanding of the challenges faced by arts educators in their efforts to cope with such educational trends as the back-to-basics movement.

NOTION #1: ARE WE ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS?

The need to ask the right questions in arts education surfaced several years ago when we were trying to stimulate the arts in one area of our state (South Carolina). Much of the discussion centered on the dearth of arts activity in the schools—that is,

the poor quality of arts activities conducted by teachers who had little or no training in the arts. When we asked how this problem might be solved, the response was that administrators (superintendent, principals, directors of instruction) should seek the advice of arts education experts for the distinct purpose of improving the quality of the arts programs. Further discussion revealed that the administrators thought the arts programs they had in their schools *were* quality arts programs. Thus they had felt no need to secure any expert advice. Because the administrators believed the arts programs in their schools were sufficient, and the arts people felt they should have been consulted for advice, everyone suffered from a *Catch 22* syndrome. What was needed and eventually accomplished was for the arts teachers identify and describe what a quality arts program was and then set out to promulgate it to the administrators. *Instead of waiting for someone else to ask the questions, the arts educators identified the correct questions and initiated action toward solving the problem.*

What this points to is the need to view the educational community in a pluralistic fashion. Historically the arts have been largely segmented from each other in the school, and more important, from those who have been managing the schools. Arts educators need to communicate with decision-makers on a regular basis—not only to describe arts needs, but also to understand administrative needs and insure that the appropriate issues are being adequately addressed.

NOTION #2: ARTS EDUCATION IS BIG BUSINESS

We have always conceived the major objective of arts supervision as the improvement of instruction and facilitating learning. It is not my intention to devalue the importance of improving instruction in the arts. But I want to emphasize as well, understanding and support of managerial and political aspects related to arts education programs. No matter how much a system is capable of, how rich its resources, how sophisticated the skills of its personnel—it is not worth anything unless it is utilized—and unless it is utilized we will never know its effectiveness.

When the arts are viewed comprehensively (art, music, drama, dance), they represent substantial human and financial resources. A comprehensive arts program involves large sums of money, numerous staff, and operates in expensive facilities utilizing costly equipment and supplies. When viewed with other areas of the curriculum, the arts command a large expenditure in the educational

enterprise.

Historically, arts educators have had a limited tradition in educational administration and management. Part of our attention should be directed to the notion that we should conceive of arts education as big business. In one small district in our state the arts personnel had a negative viewpoint regarding the amount of funds committed to the arts program. They viewed the financial investment primarily on the materials budget alone. However, when they estimated salaries, space, equipment, maintenance, fringe benefits, etc.; the total investment for this small district involved over a half million dollars.

When expenditures of this size are conceived in a larger picture, arts educators need to be concerned with program management in at least two dimensions: to provide the most effective programs for their students, and to assure the taxpayers that they are getting the best mileage out of their money with the wisest use of resources.

NOTION #3: COMPREHENSIVE ARTS EDUCATION REQUIRES MANAGERIAL KNOW-HOW

During the past few years changes have occurred that have significantly impacted on the role of arts educators and the function of arts education. These changes have occurred along four broad dimensions.

Comprehensive arts education. First is the movement to view all the arts in a comprehensive fashion. One force having an impact on arts education in recent years was federal legislation. Through arrangements with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the U.S. Office of Education contracted to establish the Alliance for Arts Education (AAE). The purpose of the program was to carry out a series of projects to encourage and assist state and local education agencies to establish and conduct programs in which all the arts were a part of the elementary and secondary school curriculum. These grants provided seed monies to set up state AAE committees and fund several local projects in each of the states.

Another force impacting on arts education has been from the foundations. The John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund has provided monies to support several pilot projects at the elementary and secondary levels. The grants were made to determine whether curricular approaches could be developed through which the arts could become an essential component of the educational process.

Arts-In-Education. The second dimension has resulted in the development of specific programs relating the arts to other areas of

the curriculum. One model, developed by the Pennsylvania State Department of Education, attempts to link the artistic process to student learning in general education:

> In the educational environment the artist's modes of activity are translated into process. To become explorers, appraisers, transformers, communicators, and perfectors, (or, in other words, to function as an artist), students need to experience perceiving, responding, understanding, creating, evaluating, and developing skills.[1]

Subsequent development has led arts-in-education projects to explore processes by which the arts can connect with reading and mathematics. Through the use of behavioral and performance objectives, arts project directors have identified arts processes which seem to focus upon specific verbal and computational skills. The purpose of these projects sought to expand the use of the arts in the school in an interdisciplinary fashion in order that learning in separate areas, i.e., social studies, reading, and math, could be assimilated by the student and incorporated into his world more effectively. Similar projects have been carried out by CEMREL, SWRL, Project Zero, and other groups.

Comprehensive arts planning. The third major change which has impacted on the ways arts programs operate is associated with the planning movement. A number of writers in the sixties were examining ways in which planning systems could be applied to education. By the seventies, several state departments of education were including planning elements in their operations. Then in 1974 emphasis was placed on planning in the arts under the guise of the Comprehensive Arts Planning and Development Project. The project included a national conference in which teams of arts educators, arts council personnel, and artists formulated drafts of arts plans for each state. A year later several state departments of education formed the Ad Hoc Coalition for Arts in Education. The coalition met on a quarterly basis to design, implement, and exchange planning strategies for initiating arts education programs.

Community arts education. The fourth major dimension impacting on arts education is the increased utilization of community arts resources. Arts teachers have always taken classes on field trips to the art museum or performed at various functions in the community. But community artists have never before been institutionalized to the point of establishing federal and state agencies throughout the nation. Programs of the National Endowment for the Arts and

their affiliate agencies, the state arts councils, now reach over a million students in all 50 states.

Some of the changes I've described have been with us for some time now. But arts educators will have to be even more alert in the future to the impact of these changes. They will also have to understand the dimensions of learning and curricular needs of other content areas. They will need to develop planning and organizational know-how. They will be working with artists not familiar with the educational system. More specifically, arts educators will be planning, organizing, and managing human and financial resources at a much broader and more complex level than before.

NOTION #4: PARITY BEGINS AT HOME

Arts educators have been so concerned about promulgating the values and concerns of our own conditions, so involved in protecting our feudal rights as freemen, that we have consequently segregated ourselves from our colleagues. We really have no peer group in the functional sense of the term. Because each of us (art, music, drama, dance) has developed separate monologues, we have not truly profited from each other. It is interesting to note that when administrators, curriculum coordinators, and the public view major portions of school programs, science and social studies are simply referred to as the science or social studies program—not astronomy, biology, physics, geography, or history. The arts are not viewed in such umbrella terms, and as such, are not viewed as major components of the school curriculum. The art room here, the music room over there, or a drama class down there—these are appendages.

Part of our feudal background is the notion that "a man's home is his castle." This has permeated the school so effectively with regard to the arts that we have carefully segmented the arts from the mainstream of the educational community.

If we really want parity for the arts in the curriculum, we must first think of parity among ourselves. If we do not think of helping each other, then all we accomplish is promoting extremely sophisticated arts appendages in the school. We have become the true inheritors of modern categorical education. One classic example of how parity was achieved at the state level was in the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. They define six major areas of education; one included the arts. This could not have been accomplished by one arts discipline alone. What was essential was the combined effort of all the arts personnel toward parity, not subject area partisanship.

NOTION #5: THE MANAGEMENT OF DECLINE

There is strong evidence that the arts is a "growth business." Francis Keppel, former commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education, cites activities in the arts during the last decade: "Community arts councils grew from 100 to 1200, state appropriations rose from 1.7 million to 55 million, National Endowment for the Arts appropriations grew from 2.5 million to 74 million, bachelors degrees in fine arts have doubled, and undergraduate enrollments have increased from 12 to 23 percent a year."[2] But Keppel also notes the declining enrollment consequent upon a lower birth rate, and the implications for teacher employment. In a more recent study related to school finance and to program area cutbacks associated with declining enrollments at the elementary and secondary levels, a projected loss of 15% in art and 16% in music was estimated for the elementary levels. At the secondary levels art and music were projected to lose 7% enrollment in each discipline.

There are other problems, such as the general decline and loss of confidence by the public, and the attitudes held by educators and artists. These latter have made over-statements and over-claims in the 1960's which promise too much or use good arguments in the wrong ways.

WHAT OPPORTUNITIES EXIST EVEN IN DECLINE?

Already traditional roles have been expanded to newer audiences. There have been a number of conferences and publications on arts for the handicapped, the aged, the gifted, for adult education, and the migrants. Also, the concept of the extended school opens up new avenues for community education, career centers in the arts, and continuing education. Finally, as student populations decrease, school plant facilities become available for possible inservice areas, curricula and materials development, and permanent centers for community arts involvement.[3]

NOTION #6: SCHOOLS ARE SPECIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Schools are social organizations, and arts programs must operate within them. Such organizations include people, their values, priorities, customs, and a number of other variables. All of these factors are interdependent. That is, arts programs do not operate in isolation—not from each other or from other parts of the school. Arts educators must understand how the school organization functions, draw upon it for expanding their own effectiveness, and contribute to others who are dependent on it. Education is a soft science—we do not have the hard data or a delivery system like the medical

profession. Turnaround time from research to practice is at best sluggish. We now need to ask what we will leave the next generation of children. Occasional in-service training, a few renewal courses, or a couple of add-on projects will not do it—there needs to be a system of *intervention.* What I propose as intervention is the system itself.

PRINCIPLES FOR SURVIVAL

Arts teachers can work together effectively to plan, organize, and implement strategies to assure parity for the arts in the schools. Arts teachers can view arts education in a comprehensive fashion. I believe they are sufficiently creative, courageous, resourceful, and energetic to carry out political strategies. In order to accomplish this, there are several principles an arts planning group should consider. I call them Principles for Survival. For example:

1. Capitalize on the skills within the arts groups. Identify the things members of the group do best. Some will be proficient at organizing or planning, while others will be more adept at speaking, evaluating, or writing. Try to match the skills with the type of activity the group is conducting. Resources have to be utilized the way they are, not the way we would like them to be.

2. Focus on making the system work for you. Find those goals, policies, values, procedures, habits, customs, and attitudes that will enable you to change, alter, discontinue, or expand aspects of arts education. Trying to change all the parts of the school system at one time is impossible. To do so leads to confrontation, which administrators are in a superior position to handle. You will seldom get anywhere and more often will lose ground. Start with one goal you are likely to fulfill through focused and intelligent political action.

3. Focus on solutions, not problems. The identification of problems is the first step, but nothing will be resolved unless alternatives are examined and solutions are presented. Most people are more receptive toward hearing possible solutions than they are to hearing someone's litany of problems, especially if they are already aware of them. Solving problems is like mending history—the best you can get is a restoration of normality. Don't stop there. Solving problems does not imply growth or expansion of arts programs. Focusing on opportunities helps us become future oriented for the extreme possibilities of arts education. What opportunities exist for new areas, levels, populations, facilities with your school system? Again, ask the right questions: "What *is* art education in our district? What *should* arts education be in our district? What *will* arts

education be in our district?"

WHERE SHOULD ARTS EDUCATORS CONCENTRATE?

There are nearly 18,000 school districts in the United States. It is estimated that only a quarter of the districts have fine arts supervisors or consultants in the central office to represent and assist the arts teachers. Most of the arts supervisors are subject-oriented and have a working relationship only with personnel in one arts discipline. Some 13,000 school districts have no centralized leadership. That is, art, music, drama, dance teachers in such places are out there alone doing their thing the best way they can. There is often little or no communication among the teachers within the discipline, and even less among all the arts teachers. By forming alliances we can maximize our efforts beyond the energies of individual teachers. Once alliances are formed, three areas of concentration seem paramount: the school, the administration, and the community.

The school. Arts educators have had a limited amount of exposure, training, and experience in arts planning and management. Our background has largely been within the artistic discipline and classroom instruction. Few art teachers and supervisors have had administrative training. Those who are good at it learned it because they had to or wanted to. Much of our traditional training has not allowed us to become involved with other areas of the curriculum, i.e., reading, science, social studies, or math. It is thus difficult to understand or relate to what is going on in the rest of the curriculum. We have always supported the notion that classroom teachers should know, understand, and teach something of the arts. It seems illogical not to have arts teachers know or comprehend something about other areas of the curriculum. What is needed is a fuller understanding of what is going on in the school—not because it is required or mandated, but because we need to know it to function effectively as a component of the whole.

The administration. The people who make critical decisions about arts education are the administrators. For example, the decision to establish an arts program (people, space, materials) where it does not currently exist usually rests with the administrator, not with the arts teachers. The policies of the educational system are established by the board of education. Whether the arts are a key priority in the school system is determined by the school board. If the board establishes an arts priority, it will be planned and implemented by the administration.

In many systems the superintendent carries a lot of weight in the

direction and degree of policy-setting at the school district level. Boards that are lax in their duties and responsibilities will find superintendents creating policy for them. Many superintendents have particular orientations that tend to influence the curriculum. Some are concerned with school/community relations, facilities, budget and finance, technical and vocational education, "back to the basics," or even the arts. Knowing their particular orientation can sometimes be an advantage to the arts group and the future development of arts programs. At the school level, the principal is the key leader. He or she has the power to influence or inhibit the growth, expansion, and parity of arts education programs. More specifically, the principal has direct control/influence over the number of arts personnel (at least in recommendations to the superintendent and board) and the quantity of equipment and space allocated to the arts. Jack Morrison, in a study of the arts in higher education sponsored by the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education, found that when a strong administrator is supportive of the arts—a dean, chancellor, vice president or president, the arts had a better chance to stand on their own feet. The administrator was in a position to cut the red tape and advance the values of the arts to deans of other disciplines, faculty, boards of trustees, and even to legislators.

Community. One of the major concerns of school boards, superintendents, and principals is that of maintaining effective school/community relations. This concern has become more paramount in recent years because of voter rejection of school bonds and taxes, issues of student discipline, and the growing concern for accountability. Because of the arrangement of school financing, local sources of funding are critical for the maintenance and operation of schools. Thus, administrators and boards have become superconscious about how the community understands, feels, and believes about what goes on in the schools. There is no reason why arts programs cannot have the potential to be as strong a representative of what administrators call school/community relations as any other single element in the educational sector. Arts programs, with solid leadership, can involve the community as audiences, as participants, as well as advocates for arts education.

To summarize, I have spoken here of only one dimension of the arts education problem: the political one, the planning, organization, management, public relations, and persuasion aspects of the larger picture. The political matrix of education has been changing fast. Today's society and education are pluralistic. Education is en-

trusted to large institutions organized for perpetuity. The assumptions that govern our expectations are largely those of the individualistic society of eighteenth-century liberal theory—yet the reality that governs education is that of organized, sometimes overorganized, power concentrations. We have passed the turning point in this trend. Everywhere there is disenchantment with modern schools, including cynicism regarding their ability to perform their expected functions.

Arts educators can help blunt that disappointment by working creatively in the political arena to develop effective programming. Money alone will not do the trick. Financial aid can only be a stimulant. The prime growth for arts education has to come out of the resources of the local districts themselves. Effective funding acts as a catalyst releasing local energies. But it may also tend to inhibit the energies of the recipient rather than release them. Where aid is used to substitute for local energies, it seldom works. For example, many districts "depressed in the arts" soaked up ESEA Title III funds in the sixties. Ten years later they are still as void of arts education as ever. By its own nature, money flows toward problems rather than toward opportunities. Thus, aid may continue to create or perpetuate dependence. Development of arts education programs is thus a function of the dynamics of individual arts educators and of the local school district. These can be supplied only by our success in creating local, responsible initiative and in multiplying human energies.

What is needed is a larger investment in training arts educators in the persuasion and politics of education. The problem is not to work harder at what we are already doing, but working smarter within the political matrix of schools. I suspect one of the problems arts planning groups will have is the risk of aiming too low. It takes as much energy and effort to plan, organize, and persuade a system to create one additional position as it does to create a new program. We will have to ask ourselves if we can afford just another position. Those who are truly productive will be those who concentrate their knowledge and energy on a larger worthwhile goal—those who set out to create something new.

REFERENCES

1. Charles B. Fowler, *The Arts Process in Basic Education*, Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1974.
2. Francis Keppel, "The Arts and Education Today and Compared to the

Sixties," In *Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future*, Stanley Madeja, (ed.) St. Louis. CEMREL, 1976.

3. For more information on the extent of arts cutbacks, see *Status of Arts Education in Public Schools: Research Report 62*, Bloomington, Indiana: Agency for Instructional Television, 1978. Also, William Mathis, "Where the Jobs Are and What They Are," *Music Educators Journal*, April 1978.
4. Jack Morrison, *The Rise of the Arts on the American Campus*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

FORWARD TO THE BASICS!

VIRGINIA M. BROUCH
and JUDITH A. KULA
Florida State University

EDITOR'S NOTE:
Visions of the future of art education and of "schooling" in general are filled with new technologies which may require a substantial re-thinking as to what constitutes "basic skills." Virginia Brouch and Judith Kula present scenarios which suggest that today's student is ill-prepared for the electronic and computer-dominated world of tomorrow, in which information and experience may flow from the ability to manipulate images and handle broad design concepts. They identify some of the specific skills which might constitute the content of a future art program.

A STORY: Saturday, 1979.
In his room, 8-year old Michael watches cartoons. Susan, 12, is working on her papier maché relief map of the South American continent, while Kevin, 15, still sleeps. In their room, Keith is watching the news and weather beamed via satellite and cable TV and governed by his bedside remote control selector. Sally has already gone to the kitchen to microwave breakfast. The digital reads 8:17.

10:04. Keith, electric-shaved and-toothbrushed sets out to jog his mile. Kevin has stumbled through 2-minute hotcakes and is working on his mini-computer assembly kit. Sally and Susan have gone to buy groceries, and Michael is watching cartoons.

12:32. During lunch, Susan relates the tale of the new electronic price readers at the grocery, Keith asks permission to bike over to the BYTE shop for transistors, and Michael asks if he can go to his friend Minelli's house to play TV soccer. Keith offers to help Sally fold laundry done while she was out shopping. Susan agrees to stack lunch and breakfast dishes in the automatic dishwasher.

Since Sally began working for MEDLAR (Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System), a medical info-ret for doctors,[1] the family has grown closer through the sharing of household tasks, and each individual seems also to have gained a greater autonomy and self-respect. Keith, who owns the local newspaper, has been studying the experimental British systems of CEEFAX, Oracle, and Viewdata.[2] Keith and Sally exchange information on their jobs as they fold or hang the family perma-presses. 197

Sally prepares another load, and Keith goes off to do the week's budgeting. Both incomes are automatically deposited to their bank; most regular monthly payments are transferred as due. Using his pocket calculator, Keith quickly settles the accounts, writes checks, and closes the books.

2:14. Sally is viewing the new, video-cassette on "The Automated Office."[3] Recently, she has been increasingly interested in setting up a word-processing service in their home. Keith joins her to learn more about the project, then convinces her to watch while he plays the home-remodeling cassette. With current trends in the electronic newspaper business, they may need to consider altering the home environment to allow individual work areas.

SUNDAY. The planned family outing involves a trip to the local art museum to view the newly installed Laserium show, in which laser-

originated light is beamed on an inner dome, to the accompaniment of classical, jazz, and rock-and-roll music.

MONDAY. Keith commutes 45 minutes to his newspaper where he spends most of his day at desk and telephone. Sally commutes 35 minutes to her desk, telephone, and teletypewriter. Kevin commutes fifteen minutes to his high school where, in his art class, the teacher provides 12" × 18" white drawing paper with one-half of a magazine and glued to one side. Using a #2 pencil, he is asked to complete the other half within 40 minutes. Susan commutes 22 minutes to her middle school where she receives an "A" in social studies for her relief map. Michael commutes 47 minutes to his school where, during his art criticism lesson, he learns to recognize, to spell, and use the words: Impressionism, genre, and assymetry.

PROBE 1.

Historically, the basic skills to be learned in American public schools have been reading, writing, and arithmetic. These skills, traditionally called the 3R's, were intended to meet the survival and productive needs of the American public. Indeed, they have been at the core of the effort to realize the dream of a literate society. Citizens have retained these basics in education even though many other factors affecting societal progress have rapidly changed as suggested by our "story". Educators have attempted to compromise with change by broadening curricular offerings as in the 1960's.

Today there seems to be more concern with coping or compromising with the future than creatively contributing to selected, intelligent change. As assessment releases of student progress in the 3R's have continued to show declining scores, parents and political leaders have tended to damn the innovations of the 1960's and, in many cases, have demanded the abolishment of most if not all of the curricular programs other than the 3R's. In a recent editorial, Arthur Foshay evaluated society's current attitude:

> The public seems to be saying, through the press, that if we don't teach the 3R's better than we ever did, they don't care what else we do. The public and the press are, in a word, wrong. There is more to life than the 3R's.[4]

If educators continue to support the theory that individuals learn best what they are interested in and can consider relevant because of application to real life experiences, can educators then account

for the lack of widespread, active interest in investigating the relevancy of the 3R's to today's TV/electronic generation of Michaels, Susans, and Kevins? If the purpose of education is to prepare children for the future, should educators be looking to the future for more relevant basic skills than those identified to meet the needs of the past?

Much of what was once communicated only through writing and learned only through reading is now communicated via combinations of visual/oral media. Don Brown has suggested that the concepts of reading and writing be broadened to include the abilities to "read television" and "read and write" graphic symbology.[6] Pocket calculators and mathematical computer games on the market today, owned, worked with, and played with by millions of American children and adults leave the traditional arithmetic skills in serious question.[8]

During the last several centuries, we have broadened our definition of transportation to include travel by foot, horse, ship, wagon, train, auto, airplane, rocket . . . with space in our brains for such things of tomorrow as teletrans. Why is it so difficult to consider a broadening of the definition of the word "literate" to also keep up with change? It is surely time to stop talking about "survival" and begin to deal with levels of creative, contributory, comprehensive literacy and to define basic skills relevant to that definition.

Writers concerned with educating for the future are presenting the profession with concept skills rather than content/discipline skills. These concept skills are "open" enough to adapt and/or change with ongoing, societal changes that can and should alter the priority rankings of discipline skills.

Sidney Harris suggested replacing the 3R's with the 3C's: creativity, competency, and comprehension (1976, 7-A).[7] Joel Barker has offered the "EFG's": ecological, futures oriented and global emphases.[8] Foshay has recommended coping skills, citizenship, morality/character, and, a valid view of self as basic skills.[9] Edward Pino writes of creating, valuing, choosing, producing/conserving, relating, and learning how to learn as the skills most basic to our transition into the future.[10] How will art educators relate art learning to the proposed basic skills of tomorrow? How will art fit into the scheme of things to come? *Will* it?

DEFINITIONS: *Scenario,* n., a description of "possible future scenes, based on projections of trends,"[11] "exploring hypothetical sequences of events for curriculum change.[12]

SCENARIO 1.

Kevin, now 25, photophones his parents from Paris where he has been working with his aquaculture network since 1988. They receive the transmission in their east solarium where all of the family vegetables are grown year around and enough solar energy produced to supply their home needs. It is a pleasant place which Keith and Michael completed from the video-pac learning method. Michael, at 18, has joined his father in the telecom system as a junior grade facts assimilator. Their studio is inside the home.

Kevin and Marietta proudly show off Andro, their 5-year old son who says hello, holds up his picto-sound toy, and proceeds to share the 4-minute video-film he has just finished producing. Marietta's dance network has been developing a new version of Barishnikov's choreograph of "Pointed Turn," and the young family expects to teletrans to Arkansas for the Spring, Global Arts Festival. Susan links in from North Africa where her geo-bio network has been milking oil trees. She and Jeremy have been serving in the World Share Corp for three years. Sally relates her own latest achievement, the installation of "bit-a-discs" in her word-processing service. She and her network partners have been developing the project over the last three years. Communications now occur without need for paper copies, can be translated into every known language and permanently stored by category on miniature discs.

On Monday, no one goes to art class.

SCENARIO 2.

Janet, a single parent in the year 1990, has the legal maximum of two loaned children, Marta who is 7 and Thom who is 5. Together, they consult the 2-way TV cable counsellor during their breakfast. Marta agrees that she should continue her lessons in video reading and computer math, both of which she enjoys, but she is bored with the social studies info-ret. She and Janet elect to upgrade the level of difficulty another two points. At 11:00, a holograph lesson on dance will be received for her continued training in contemporary ballet. Thom will join her for those lessons after finishing his special report on info-ret resources, a high-density learning game to improve his research skills. All three will lunch at MacGrugers High Protein Walk-Thru on their way to the neighborhood social center, where each will meet with their local networks to continue their separate projects. Thom is a part of a mixed-age drama network practicing a musical they have been writing, scoring, and choreographing. Marta is on the firing schedule for the laser kiln, and Janet is ready to telefix a demonstration and one-woman show

of her new "flaxton" weavings. The presentation is scheduled for global access through ARTLAB, the info-ret service established by the U.S. National Endowment in 1980 and incorporated by the World Endowment for the Arts upon its founding on Peace Day, 1985.

SCENARIO 3.
Keith and Michael have decided to surprise Sally by remodeling her work area while she and her network partners visit their local social centers to contribute their "bit-a-disc" invention to the World Science Foundation system by means of photophone link. They have agreed to equally share the stipend for their contribution, and Sally, together with Keith and Michael, participated in the study of aesthetics, design, and building materials learning pacs. She also had a complex analysis of her personality components and work needs done by ARTAPPLIX. What she doesn't know is that Keith arranged for the materials and work robots to complete the task during her 3-4 hour absence this afternoon.

PROBE 2.
The learning pacs described in the above scenarios emanate from elements of the "do-it-yourself" movement and the guild structure of the middle ages. Unlike the former, few instructions are written, and rather like the latter, information is conveyed from human to human by means of communications systems. 201

High density refers to concentration of focus and intention as well as the arrangement of levels of difficulty so that vast amounts of relevant knowledge can be acquired in condensed amounts of time. These units become increasingly individualized as they are developed in quantity and increasingly qualitative as they are refined by contributors and assimilators. The contributors are the learners who feedforward into the system with either refinements or extensions of previously known information. Any human is capable of extending in some area. Every human can contribute to refinement of experiences.

Although learning is truly life-long, as admitted for some years, learning to learn and taking great pleasure in learning will have happened to individuals before the age of ten. Much of this learning will take place in the comfort of the home environment, and much will happen in social centers.

There is no private transportation mentioned in these scenarios, as humans will once again learn the joys of physical mobility and have visual-verbal access through advanced communications sys-

tems. Travel is accelerated through teletransportation, which is, simply, to beam one's whole person via satellite as we now beam voices and pictures.

Most accommodation units are almost totally self-sustaining in terms of nutrition and energy needs and may contain as many people as wish to gather there for as long as they desire to remain. "Mobilias," like the inns of the past, will provide stopping places based upon individual interests.[13]

Networks, as referred to in the scenarios and already in use, are special interest groups whose prototypes date almost as far back as the origins of people who improved their lives through communal sharing of tasks.

Peace Day is the interdenominational celebration of peace and the dignity of humanity, the surcease of physical conflict, and the reassignment of all defense budgets to communication and development for positive causes throughout the world.[14]

What will be the definition of art in such a world? What might we be doing today to prepare for this possibility?

PROBE 3.

In *Education Through Art,* Sir Herbert Read listed the arts as: "Design (visual/plastic), Music, Dance, Poetry, Drama and Craft."[15] In Alvin Toffler's *Culture Consumers* we find ". . . painting, music, drama, sculpture, dance, literature and the art film."[16] During the 1970's, the Kennedy Center's Alliance for Arts program gave rise to the group identified as DAMT, representing dance, art, music, and theatre, and this focus has been promulgated through the National Art Education Association.[17] With but a quick review, discrepancies can be seen between and among definitions of art, yet there is much agreement about the components of what arts might be.

In *Landscapes of Learning* a phenomenological, gestalt, humanistic treatise on "Artistic and Aesthetic Considerations," Maxine Greene unifies the separate arts. While differences between each are acknowledged, there are no barriers to their working together to intensify experience and heighten awarenesses of perceptual nature. Greene's arguments support a futures curriculum that exemplifies a unification of purpose among the arts, not just for the arts, but for total human development and enrichment.[18]

Based upon a futuristic frame of reference, we propose ten areas for the arts of the future, areas which encompass integrations of arts experiences emanating from concepts basic to each and all of the arts and which may serve as points of departure for

futures curriculum development for the arts.

While some of these notions have been introduced to our art education literature, and some are already receiving considerable attention, others have not yet even been mentioned.

1. Computer Graphics. We have been experiencing some of the effects of this art tool for over ten years through the production of TV cartoons, commercials, station identification constructs, and, more recently, TV games such as soccer, tennis, basketball, and the like. "Computer graphics have also grown in film and video, rapidly becoming an important, recognized, new art form."[18] Individual artists are creating with this tool; mill designers are generating new patterns for fibers production; Boeing uses it for the design of complex electrical systems for large aircraft, automotive designers use it to create new cars. The concepts and competencies required of our youth for either coping, compromising, or changing their futures because of it are not yet written into our curricula. The impact on art education ought to be at least as great as that which the electronic hand-held calculator has had on math education.

Within five years, home computer graphics could well be introduced as the "new, art toy" for holiday gift giving. Are we ready for that in our schools and homes? What "basics" will our young learners need to utilize this new resource?

2. VTR-Mixing. For some years now, art teachers have had access to the equipment necessary to teach children how to videotape and produce their own TV shows. Yearly this equipment has become less expensive, lighter to transport and more versatile. Young people have responded with excitement to the holistic art potential; but where is our art education research on this topic? Must this, too, become a drawing "toy" for the general public before we see the vast potential for perceptual education?[20]

3. Environmental Design/Aesthetic Engineering. One or other or both of these designations should receive optimum attention from art education. Slowly, over the last, almost 20 years, largely due to June McFee and others,[21] we have again entered into that cycle of repeated patterns initiated perhaps in this country by Benjamin Franklin and exemplified further in art education by the Owatonna Project and such writings as those of Faulkner, Ziegfeld and Hill's *Art Today*.[22] Art belongs in society, working to improve the human endeavor and the quality of human life, not so much in terms of how high to hang a picture over the sofa, but in the sense of total environmental concern, integration of natural and manmade forms for the better balance of ecological states.[23]

4. Triscoteches. This is one of many logical and possible steps to the current disco sensory environment. With our culture's concern for nostalgics, it should be possible for individuals to visually reconstruct environmental eras of the past. If so, these same devices could be manipulated to design and produce future environments. Who will help our youth to create and control rather than merely submit to such media in their futures?

5. Intergalactic Light Fantastic. Throughout the last twenty years, the colors experienced by our youth have come with increased frequency more from the prisms of the physicist than the pigments of the artist. While art teachers are still discovering light shows as a curriculum variable, not enough has been made of the instructional potential of light-based color, with which students are increasingly familiar due to light shows and laserion-style performances.

6. Cinematography. Note that this is the only carry-over from the original lists of the arts from the 1940's to the present, and that it

186

derives from Toffler's "art film." Even in the present state, so far advanced from Toffler's concepts, this may only be an intermediary technology between the single arts of the past and a prototype of the future with increased video facility. It is worth attending to in the present precisely because it so aptly unifies perceptions in the individual arts of traditional definition.

7. Fashion Design. "Life Support Suit (LSS) . . . weather-proof-fireproof-cashproof-drownproof-bulletproof apparel providing continuous protection from most external dangers. This light, all-year LSS is also permanently linked to telemed facilities for continuous monitoring of the individual's body functions."[24] What must art students know to contribute to the color and design of such wardrobes of the future?

8. Body Design. Alterations to body appearance have been taking place throughout recorded history. Even Dennis White's report is probably too conservative.[25] Are our youth learning of this from us? Are we examining the values involved in such decision-making? Are we preparing youth to contribute creatively and constructively?

9. Learning Pacs. Imagine the amazement of 21st Century education historians as they glance back to the 1960's and 1970's to see what we did with behavioral goals and objectives and our antiquated technology: not only equipment/machinery, but also our values, processes and applications for learning. The learning materials that show promise today are too often missing in many schools. These often derive from games theory and generally involve highly intensified visual experience to motivate the learning of other academic concepts. Learning is active rather than passive and individual more often than grouped. In this arena, most of us, as art teachers, are still at our sinks washing brushes instead of at the cathode ray tube receivers working with our light pencils.[26]

10. Arts Criticism/Aesthetics. Many persons concerned with the processes of arts understanding, appreciation, judgment—with aesthetic valuing—have been attempting to provide learners with the most vital, most necessary tool for creative change: i.e., a base from which to evaluate the overwhelming perceptual data daily encountered and strategies with which to accomplish such evaluation. Every human must make perceptual judgments daily; aesthetic valuing is the qualitative base. Lack of the arts and of quality perceptual evaluations is what Albert Tsugawa described as anaesthetic, a dulling of the senses, numbness.[27]

We are convinced, as is Emile Tainmont, founder of the Belgian system of art education known as Positive Aesthetics, that ". . . vis-

ual perception must be an aesthetic perception and that this kind of perception can and should be taught."[28] Our youth need an aesthetic system today to evaluate environments, television, computer graphics, video programs, the cinema, discoteches, fashion, every element with which they come in daily contact. Are our art classes doing that?

What then will be the basic skills necessary for competent, creative performance in these ten areas? What art skills will be needed, and how will these be related to the basic skills?

The following illustration was prepared to demonstrate the relationship between the basic skill concepts suggested by the authors of this article. A (+) indicates a direct relationship while an (0) indicates little or no relationship.

Figure 1: DIRECT RELATIONSHIP OF FUTURES SKILLS TO FUTURE ART AREAS

FUTURE ART AREAS	SKILLS IDENTIFIED AS BASIC TO THE FUTURE														
	Creativity	Competency	Comprehension	Ecology	Futures Orientation	Citizenship	Coping	Morals/Character	Self-Concept	Valuing	Choosing	Producing	Conserving	Relating	Learning
Computer Graphics	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
VTR Mixing	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Environmental Design	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Triscoteches	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Light	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cinematography	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Fashion Design	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Body Design	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Learning Pacs	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Arts Criticism/ Aesthetics	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+

It is obvious that a very strong relationship of futures skills (FS) and future art areas (FAA) exists. The breadth of the concept definitions not only permits but requires a relatedness with the art

areas not previously required by the specificity of subject matter skills.

Consider the ten areas of art as ten general and basic art concepts for the future. Figure 2 was prepared to illustrate the relationship of these factors.

Figure 2: DIRECT RELATIONSHIP OF FUTURE ART AREAS TO FUTURES SKILLS

SKILLS IDENTIFIED AS BASIC TO THE FUTURE	FUTURE ART AREAS									
	Computer Graphics	VTR Mixing	Environmental Design	Triscotèches	Light	Cinematography	Fashion Design	Body Design	Learning Pacs	Arts Criticism/ Aesthetics
Creativity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Competency	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Comprehension	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ecology	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Futures Orientation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Citizenship	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+
Coping	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+
Morals/Character	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Self-Concept	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Valuing	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Choosing	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Producing	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Conserving	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Relating	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Learning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Again, the degree of relatedness is extremely high. The arts are a very important component of all basic learning skills rather than continuing, as in the past, as a very separated, isolated entity.

Let us again project a future, one that has incorporated some of our proposals.

SCENARIO 4.

For their 40th anniversary, in 1999, Keith and Sally teletrans to Clearwater, Florida, to be with Kevin, Marietta, and their now 9-year old granddaughter, Kesal. Andro, at 14, is in his third year of astro-apprenticeship on the Uni-lab 3 stationed near Venus. Susan has teletransed from India where the eco-structure has now been permanently stabilized to provide totally for the productive needs of the people choosing to live there. All links to World Info-ret have been completed and through high density learning, Info-Share will provide the opportunity for socio-individualization-advancement. Residents of the area will be capable of sustained contribution within the coming year.

Michael photophones from Uni-lab 7 and reports progress in his work as chief aesthetic engineer. When the arts and science foundations finally merged in 1955, he retooled through extensive study and was selected to lead the network on his uni-lab. Among other things, his and several other uni-lab networks will present earth with a spectacular, intergalactic light fantastic show during the forthcoming Peace Day eclipse.

Keith and Sally tour the aquaculture center which Kevin manages, amazed by the size of the atmospheric control dome that conserves energy so efficiently yet optimizes production of seafoods. They enjoy a brief swim in the clear, Gulf waters.

Marietta has arranged a performance celebration at their social center, and many dear friends have teletransed in for the event. Kesal presents her self-developed, high density current arts trends pac for special preview and receives much applause and praise. Marietta's new network performs their self-choregraphed, anniversary operballe, and Keith and Sally end the evening at a Triscoteche arranged to accurately simulate their original wedding reception environment.

PROBE 4.

Because of interrelating skill/concept areas, we find a greater participation of the family members in productive activities which we would, today, describe as art activities. As Esfandiary has stated: "With commitment, intelligent planning, and vision, we can now accomplish anything."[29]

Straddling the present with one foot in the past and one set toward the future, we must intelligently relinquish some of our cherished ideas and carefully consider the needs of the future we might participate in creating.

The ten areas of art and the futures skills concepts selected here are but points of departure for the generation of still other arts

areas and still other futures skills. Within education, people are saying that it won't do to go "back", we must look ahead. Art education must play an important role in the future to be created.

The 3R's will be with us for many years, but they will change in definition and application. Once minds are set toward the future, and, with willingness to learn, we can realize how far removed from the 3R's we already are. We can begin to view these skills in light of tomorrow's needs.

It will not do to go "back" to the basics of the past. The children of today are not accepting such a direction and the children of tomorrow. . . . . .

REFERENCES

1. The Futurist, "Computers Bring Library to the Doctor's Office," 12:2, 1978, p. 75.
2. Kenneth Edwards, "The Electronic Newspaper," *The Futurist*, 12:2, 1978, pp. 79-84.
3. Hollis Vail, "The Automated Office," *The Futurist*, 12:2, 1978, pp. 73-78.
4. Arthur Foshay, "It Could Work Better," *Educational Leadership*, 26:3, 1978, p. 164.
5. Don W. Brown, "Reading TV: Today's Basic," *Educational Leadership*, 36:3, 1978, pp. 216-220.
6. Leonard O. Nashman, "A Contemporary Parable: Will Technology Revolutionize Education?" Phi Delta Kappan, 60:4, 1978, pp. 294-6.
7. Sidney Harris, "Here Lies the Catch to 'Basic' Education," *The Miami Herald*, December 13, 1976:7-A.
8. Joel Barker, "ABC's/EFG's," A presentation at the Futures of Education Conference, St. Cloud State University, June 20, 1978.
9. Foshay, *Loc. cit.*
10. Edward Pino, "Schooling . . . Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow, in *Futuring: Its Implications for Education*, edited by Dennis Van Avery, Rocky Mountain Teacher Corps Publication, 1978.
11. Patricia W. Garlan, Maryjane Dunstan, Dyan Howell Pike, *Star Sight: Visions of the Future*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977, p. 39.
12. Harold G. Shane, "Future-Planning as a Means of Shaping Educational Change," *The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect*, Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1971, p. 215.
13. F.M. Esfandiary, *Telespheres*, New York: Popular Library, 1977, p. 170.
14. Christopher Dede, Closing address of the First Education Section Meeting of the World Future Society, October 1978.
15. Herbert Read, *Education Through Art*, London: Faber & Faber, 1943; rev. 1947, p. 9.
16. Alvin Toffler, *The Culture Consumers*, New York: St. Martin's Press,

1964, p. 10.

17. John J. Mahlmann, Project Director, *Arts Education Advocacy*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education and J.F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts, 1976, p. 24.
18. Maxine Greene, *Landscapes of Learning*, New York: Teachers College Press, 1978, pp. 159-210.
19. Neesa Sweet and Vicky O'Hara, "Technology and the Times: Computer Graphics," *Personal Computing*, 2:2, 1978, p. 49.
20. Ken Winslow, "The Impact of Home Video on the Schools," *Media & Methods*, 14:2, 1977, pp. 28-34.
21. June K. McFee, *Preparation for Art*, Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1961, rev.: 1970.
22. Ray Nelson Faulkner, Edwin Ziegfeld, and Gerald Hill, *Art Today*, New York: H. Holt and Company, 1941.
23. Reference is made here to each and all of the articles in the September, 1978 issue of *Art Education* devoted to environmental design education. Also see Stephen Dobbs, "From Buck Rogers to Buckminster Fuller: On the Future of Art," *Art Education*, 29:1, 1976, pp. 8-11.
24. Esfandiary, *op. cit.*
25. Dennis W. White, "A Review of Research on Intentional Modification of the Human Form: Implications for Art Education," *Studies in Art Education*, 17:3, 1976, pp. 45-55.
26. George R. Knight, "Reschooling Society: A New Road to Utopia," *Phi Delta Kappan* 60:4, 1978, pp. 289-91, and William Miller, "What Will the Future Bring for Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60:4, 1978, pp. 287-89.
27. Albert Tsugawa, "The Nature of the Aesthetic and Human Values," *Art Education*, 21:8, 1968, pp. 9-15.
28. Emile Tainmont, "Aesthetic Education: A Critique" *Art Education*, 21:7, 1968, p. 28.
29. Mico Delianova, "Optimism, Abundance, Universalism, and Immortality: The Philosophy of F.M. Esfandiary, a Futurist Interview," *The Futurist*, 12:3, 1978, p. 186.

CONTRIBUTORS

Kathryn Bloom has been director of the Arts in Education Program of the JDR 3rd Fund since 1968. This Program established the first pilot projects designed to test the feasibility of comprehensive arts in education programs which would make all the arts integral to the education of all students. It has continued to be involved in collaborative arrangements with selected schools, school districts, and state education departments in the planning, development, and implementation of such programs.

Prior to this assignment, Ms. Bloom served as director of the Arts and Humanities Program of the U.S. Office of Education in Washington, with joint responsibilities as special advisor to the Commissioner of Education. A graduate with distinction of the University of Minnesota, Ms. Bloom has taught art, was a lecturer at the Minneapolis Art Institute and supervisor of art education at the Toledo Museum of Art.

Virginia M. Brouch is chair and associate professor in the Department of Art Education/Craft Design, Florida State University, Tallahassee. She has contributed to the literature of the field and served as a member of the editorial board of *Art Education* and currently serves as a consultant to *Review of Research in Visual Arts Education.* She has recently been a contributing member of the National Teacher Exam Art Section revision committee for Educational Testing Service and is project director for the committee generating art competency standards for the State of Florida Department of Education Council on Teacher Education. Dr. Brouch is also a member of the World Future Society and the arts education network. Current interests include the development of a futures-oriented program in art education for pre-service and inservice teachers.

Harry S. Broudy is emeritus professor of philosophy of education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and has lectured at various universities in the United States and abroad. A former student of Alfred North Whitehead and C.I. Lewis, Dr. Broudy showed an early interest in philosophical problems ranging from Classical Realism to Existentialism. Aesthetic education has also been one of his primary concerns, as indicated by such books as *Enlightened Cherishing: An Essay on Aesthetic Education* (University of Illinois, 1972). Dr. Broudy has served on the editorial boards of *The Music Educators Journal* and *The Journal of Aesthetic Education.* He was the first Visiting Distinguished Professor at Memorial University in Newfoundland and has been a Fulbright Fellow in Australia and a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in

the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford. Dr. Broudy is a past president of the Philosophy of Education Society.

Michael D. Day is associate professor and head of the Art Education Program at the University of Minnesota. After an extensive background in teaching in the public schools at the secondary level, Dr. Day completed his professional training at Stanford and became chairperson of the Art Education Division at the University of South Carolina. His interests include curriculum development, evaluation of art programs, and children's artistic development. He has been awarded research grants for his study of art preference and judgment and for examination of the Artists-in-Schools program. In 1978 Dr. Day was the recipient of the Manuel Barkan Memorial Award, which is given by the National Art Education Association for exceptionally scholarly and meritorious work.

Rogena M. Degge is an assistant professor of art education at The Ohio State University, the co-author with June King McFee of *Art, Culture and Environment: A Catalyst for Teaching*, and current president of the NAEA Women's Caucus. Teaching and research interests include the application of ethnographic field methods at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the study of and planning for non-traditional audiences in art education, and the examination of television aesthetics for curricular and research implications. Prior to graduate studies at the University of Oregon, Dr. Degge taught elementary and secondary art for seven years, primarily to Mexican-American students in central California.

Stephen Mark Dobbs is associate professor of creative arts interdisciplinary at San Francisco State University, where he simultaneously serves as assistant to the president of the University. Educated at Stanford in philosophy, history, and education, Dr. Dobbs served as a Post Graduate Research Psychologist with the Aesthetic Education Project at the University of California at Santa Cruz, and as a research assistant on the Kettering Project at Stanford. He has been a research associate of the Institute of American History at Stanford and a program analyst for the Arts in Education Program of The JDR 3rd Fund at Bank Street College in New York City. He is interested in interdisciplinary studies and the convergence of arts and humanities education, and his research focus currently includes the economic bases of the arts and crime and the arts.

A. Graham Down, a native of England and an American citizen for fifteen years, has been involved with various aspects of both private and public education. With degrees from both Cambridge and Oxford Universities, he was a music and history teacher and an administrator at the Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, New Jersey, assistant to the president of Bradford College, Haverhill, Massachusetts, and acting director of the Advanced Placement Program for the College Board. Since 1974 he has been executive director of the Council for Basic Education, a non-profit organization in Washington, D.C., with the primary purpose of strengthening teaching and learning in American public schools. Mr. Down is an associate of the Royal College of Musicians and director of music and organist at Western Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C.

Elliot W. Eisner is professor of education and art at Stanford University, and the author of numerous books and articles about art education. His contributions to theory and dialogue in the field include *Educating Artistic Vision* (Macmillan, 1972). He has lectured in Canada, Europe, Israel, Africa, and Australia. Dr. Eisner's research interests include the study of children's artistic development and the uses of art criticism as tools for the evaluation of educational settings. He is the recipient of the Palmer O. Johnson Memorial Award for research from the American Educational Research Association, a John Simon Guggenheim Fellowship, a Fulbright Fellowship, and the Manuel Barkan Memorial Award of the National Art Education Association. Currently Dr. Eisner is president of the National Art Education Association.

Martin Engel is arts and humanities advisor to the National Institute of Education. He also serves as senior program officer and education research specialist in the Teaching and Learning Program. He has been actively involved in day centers and children's museums. He is presently on loan, part-time, to the Institute for Museum Services, another HEW agency. Before coming to Washington, he was associate professor of history and fine arts at Carnegie-Mellon University. His Ph.D. is from Syracuse University in interdisciplinary humanities studies.

Edmund Burke Feldman is Alumni Foundation Distinguished Professor of Art at the University of Georgia, and has taught previously at Carnegie-Mellon University, the State University of New York at New Paltz, and The Ohio State University. He is the author of several books including *Becoming Human Through Art* (Prentice-

Hall, 1970) and *Varieties of Visual Experience* (Prentice-Hall and Harry Abrams, 1971). Dr. Feldman has also authored more than four dozen articles ranging from aesthetic education to art history and humanities interests. He has lectured extensively on art criticism and aesthetics, and served as visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley. He serves on the editorial boards of *The Georgia Review* and *The Journal of Aesthetic Education.*

John I. Goodlad is the dean of the Graduate School of Education at the University of California, Los Angeles. Dr. Goodlad received his higher education at the University of British Columbia and The University of Chicago. At the latter institution, he was professor of education and director of the Center for Teacher Education for several years. He has published extensively; his most recent book is *Curriculum Inquiry: The Study of Curriculum Practice* (McGraw-Hill, 1979). Dr. Goodlad has served on numerous editorial boards and special commissions, including the President's Task Force on Early Education and the President's Task Force on Education of the Gifted. He has served on the Boards of such organizations as the UNESCO Institute for Education, The National Humanities Faculty, the National Society for the Study of Education, and the National Academy for Education. In 1967-68 Dr. Goodlad was president of the American Educational Research Association.

Thomas A. Hatfield has served as the state art consultant with the South Carolina Department of Education for the past eight years. His public school experience includes teaching art at the elementary and secondary levels, to the handicapped, and serving as a regional art coordinator. Dr. Hatfield has long been an advocate of expanding the political and managerial skills of art educators at the local level and supports the notion that long range planning is a prime vehicle in achieving parity for arts education. He was the principal author of the *Comprehensive Arts Planning Guide* published by the South Carolina Department of Education and has served as a consultant to various groups and organizations on comprehensive arts planning at the state and local levels.

Irving Kaufman is professor of art at The City College, City University of New York. He is a practicing artist, exhibiting regularly in New York City and nationally. He has written on a wide variety of issues including the influence of culture in the classroom, such as in his book *Art and Education in Contemporary Culture* (Macmillan,

1966). Dr. Kaufman has engaged forcefully in the debate in art education over the value of empirical research, and has stressed the "art" in art education in numerous publications and conference addresses. He is also a former president of the Institute for the Study of Art in Education.

Diana Korzenik is a writer/painter/chairperson of art education at Massachusetts College of Art, Boston. She received her doctorate from Harvard Graduate School of Education, following years of art teaching in the New York City Public Schools.

Her writing focusses on socialization as it emerges in art and psychological development. Publications include *Art and Cognition*, "What's in a Picture?" and *Studies in Art Education*. Dr. Korzenik currently serves on the Editorial Board of *Studies* and is Eastern Region director-elect of the Higher Education Division of NAEA.

Judy Kula, assistant professor of art education at The Florida State University, Tallahassee, has contributed to the field primarily in the areas of curriculum and research. As an active member of NAEA, ASCD, and the World Future Society, she has been working to integrate these involvements with emphasis on futures thinking and programming. As a member of WFS, she has attended two major conferences and presented an art related paper at the international meeting of the Education Section. Dr. Kula is also a member of the arts education network of WFS.

As director of futures studies for the Department of Art Education/Craft Design, Dr. Kula is currently working to design and develop the program for preservice and inservice teachers.

Vincent Lanier is professor of art education at the University of Oregon. He has been involved in art teacher preparation since 1950 and was director of the NAEA sponsored, USOE funded Newer Media Project during 1965-1966. He has published one textbook and several smaller volumes and a number of articles in periodicals such as *Studies in Art Education, Phi Delta Kappan, Journal of Aesthetic Education, Art Education,* and others. Dr. Lanier's professional interests include art education theory, aesthetics, and media.